

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.
APRIL, 1873.

ART. I.—THE ROMAN QUESTION.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

WE present to our readers in the present number of the REVIEW, a somewhat full statement of the issue between the assumptions of the Papacy in the nineteenth century and the Old Catholics, together with an extended article on the subject, by Dr. John W. Nevin. It is scarcely necessary to state that in doing so our aim is to afford an opportunity to the readers of the REVIEW to become more fully acquainted with the question at issue, and to hold up its significance and importance before the American theological public, without committing ourself to any particular theory as to the result of the contest. How the result will finally shape itself must be left for history itself to determine.

The contest is not a new one in the Roman Catholic Church. It is only bringing forward an unsolved problem which has been struggling towards solution in that Church for ages. The question of the relation between the Pope and the Council occupied the attention of the Reformatory Councils of Constance and Basel, even before the Reformation. The conclusion to which they came was different from that of the late Vatican.

Council. The only ecumenical council held since the Reforming Councils of Constance and Basel was the Council of Trent. At that Council the issue was indeed raised, but it came to no decision. The Jesuits were then already the advocates of such primacy of the pope as would constitute the bishops simply his legates. Their cause was argued in a lengthy speech by their General, *Lainez*, with great vehemence. It is interesting to see how the question was handled in that Council by the head of the Jesuits. In his speech as reported by one who stood indeed in opposition to the court of Rome, but whose report in this case is no doubt substantially correct, he says:*

“That he (the Pope) is the only Pastor is plainly proved by the words of Christ, when He said He had other sheep which He will gather together, and so one sheep-fold should be made, and one Shepherd. The Shepherd meant in that place cannot be Christ, because He would not speak in the future, that there shall be one Shepherd, Himself then being a Shepherd, and therefore, it must be understood another Shepherd, which was to be constituted after Him, which can be no other but Peter and his successors. And here let it be noted that the precept, ‘Feed the flock,’ is found but twice in the Scriptures, once given by Christ to Peter only, ‘Feed my sheep;’ again by Peter to others, ‘Feed the flock allotted to you.’ And if the bishops had received any jurisdiction from Christ, it would be equal in all, and no difference between Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops; neither could the Pope meddle with that authority, to diminish or take it all away, as he cannot in the power of *order*, which is from God.” In reply to the contrary arguments he said, “According to the order instituted by Christ, the Apostles were ordained Bishops, not by Christ, but by Saint Peter, receiving jurisdiction from him only; and many Catholic doctors do hold that this was observed: which opinion is very probable. But the others who say the Apostles were ordained by Christ do add that His Divine Majesty in so doing,

* History of the Council of Trent by *Polano*, translated by *Brent*. 2d edition, London. Printed by Bonham Norton & John Bill, Printers to the King’s most Excellent Majesty, MDCXXIX.

did prevent (anticipate) the office of Peter, by doing for that one time what belongs to him, giving to the Apostles that power which they ought to receive from Peter, even as God took some of the spirit of Moses and divided it among the seventy judges. . . . To those who inferred that, therefore, the Pope might refuse to make Bishops, and so himself remain the only man, he answered, it was God's ordination there should be many Bishops in the Church, to assist Him, and therefore He was bound to preserve them." To those who said the Council could not have authority if none of the Bishops had it (a poser we should say), he answered that "this was not inconvenient, but a very plain and necessary consequence, yea, if every particular Bishop in Council may err, it cannot be denied that they may err altogether." So the speech ran. On the other side it was urged by the Bishop of Paris "that instead of a celestial kingdom, this doctrine would make the Church, not a kingdom, but a temporal tyranny; that it taketh from the Church the title of Spouse of Christ, and maketh it a servant, prostituted to a man. He (Lainéz) will have but one Bishop instituted by Christ, and the others not to have any authority but dependent from him, which is as much as to say, that there is but one Bishop and the others are his vicars, to be removed at his pleasure."

The time was not come for such an enunciation; the proposition of *Lainéz* was withdrawn, and the more moderate *canon* substituted, "Si quis dixerit, in ecclesia catholica non esse hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quæ constat ex epis-copis, presbyteris et ministris: anathema sit."*

Thus the issue was suppressed until the recent Vatican Council, when the Decrees herewith published, enunciated to the world the final conclusion on the subject of the infallibility of the Pope.

Against these decrees, enunciating the infallibility of the Pope, the Old Catholics protest and maintain that in this the Church as represented by the Vatican Council, has departed

* *Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentinæ, Lipsiæ, 1866.*

from its own faith and teaching. They do so, as we understand, first, on historical grounds. The work which the Council undertook to decide was primarily of a historical character. Such is to some extent the work of every Council, but was especially such in the late Vatican Council. They came together to investigate what have always been the faith and teaching of the Church on this subject. The necessary conditions for such an investigation are that the necessary historical documents or material should be present, and that full freedom should be allowed in the Council to sift and consider it. For, even allowing that an ecumenical Council is guided infallibly by the Spirit into the truth, yet the Spirit cannot be supposed to provide the conditions of right knowledge in the case miraculously. The Holy Spirit did not do this even for the inspired writers of the New Testament Scripture. So far as they recorded historical facts, it is presupposed that they had access to these facts, as we know they had, without a miracle to supply them with the facts.

Now it is urged by the Old Catholics that the historical material at hand in the Council was not sufficient to establish the conclusion to which they arrived, and that some of the material on which they based their conclusion was spurious. This their best historians assert, as for instance Dr. Döllinger.* The insufficiency of history to establish the fact that the Church has always believed infallibility to reside in the Pope, and the contradiction involved by such a declaration was pointed out by "Janus" before and during the meeting of the Vatican Council.† The eminent scholars among the Old Catholics have not failed to point out the same thing since the meeting of that Council.

Besides it is maintained that the Council was not free during its meetings,—that it did not allow free discussion and the free expression of opinion by all its members. The current reports from Rome, and instances of coercion given and substantiated

* Döllinger's Reply to the Archbishop of Munich.

† See "The Pope and the Council." By Janus. 1869.

by individual members themselves, sufficiently establish this. Indeed the Jesuit position that the Council was not called to decide upon the truth, but only to confirm what the Pope had already decided for them, was maintained. From their stand-point it would seem that "the only business of Bishops at a Council must be to inform the Pope of the condition of their dioceses, to give him their advice, and form a picturesque background for the solemn promulgation of his decrees," and so far as the giving of advice was concerned, it must be an echo of the syllabus to be supported and maintained.

The Old Catholics, moreover, take issue in regard to the consequences that must result from the enactment of the decree of papal infallibility. These, too, were foretold by "Janus." "If this desire is accomplished, a new principle of immeasurable importance, both retrospective and prospective, will be established—a principle which, when once irrevocably fixed, will extend its dominion over men's minds more and more, till it has coerced them into subjection to every Papal pronouncement in matters of religion, morals, politics and social science. For it will be idle to talk any more of the Pope's encroaching on a foreign domain; he, and he alone, as being infallible, will have the right of determining the limits of his teaching and action at his own good pleasure, and every such determination will bear the stamp of infallibility. When once the narrow adherence of many Catholic theologians to the ancient tradition and the Church of the first six centuries is happily broken through, and the pedantic horror of new dogmas completely got rid of, and the well-known canon of St. Vincent, '*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*,' which is still respected here and there, set aside—then every Pope, however ignorant of theology, will be free to make what use he likes of his power of dogmatical creativeness, and to erect his own thoughts into the common belief, binding on the whole Church."

The consequences, in regard to conscience, of the Vatican decrees are also pointed out. This point is brought out forcibly and eloquently in the address of Prof. Reinkens at the Cologne Congress, and published in the January number of

this Review. Attempts to bind the conscience appear to have occurred before. Popes had issued bulls such as the one against the Jansenists, where it was enjoined that the faithful not only believe that the errors condemned are contrary to the true faith, but equally that they must believe that the errors condemned were contained in the work of Jansenius, thus rendering the Pope's judgment of the meaning of a book, as a matter of fact, binding on the conscience, as well as upon a matter of doctrine. But in the light of the Councils of Constance and Basel, and in the absence of any decree of the infallibility of the Pope, Catholics, while submitting to the order of the Pope, could still save their conscience. Now, however, the case is different. There can be no such reservation. Those who do not believe that the Pope is infallible, as heartily and truly as they believe in the divinity of Christ, for instance, are excommunicate here and eternally damned hereafter.

There are some who still try to save themselves as Father Hyacinthe explains it, or at least he tries to save them, by making a distinction between "true truth and official truth." * They give in their adhesion to the decree of Papal infallibility by a coercion of the will, by a silencing of conscience, or whatever it may be called. "The world should not be misled into believing that because almost every one of the Catholic bishops have *submitted* to the decrees of the Vatican Council, they believe in them (and we cannot attempt here to show how that 'submission' has been exacted), and much less that they accept the present condition and government of the Church as wise and sanitary. We believe that every intelligent bishop in the Roman communion deplores the present state of affairs as inextricable for the Church, dangerous for governments, and fatal to the individual faith. We know of those who groan in silence, being conscience-bound; others who writhe under continuous torture of the conflict between earthly responsibilities and their interior convictions. Others there are given over to despair; but, thank Heaven, there are some who hope, because

* Letter of Father Hyacinthe in the *Independent*, April, 1873.

they trust not in man, but in God." In proof of this state of mind and conscience in the Episcopate, he then gives extracts from letters from most worthy and eminent bishops in the Roman Church, which he obtained permission to publish.

Again the old Catholics protest against the Vatican decree, that it interferes with loyalty on the part of subjects to the State. Here also we come upon an old and vexed question which never came to any final historical solution in the Catholic Church. The relation of Church and State must be determined in a historical way, consistently with the claims and prerogatives of the Church as well as those of the State, just as the relation of the supernatural and natural, in general, must determine itself historically. We may, indeed, say the one is above the other, the spiritual over the temporal, but this is not defining or settling their historical relation to each other. The State has an authority from God in its sphere; the family has authority in its sphere, and neither has the right to assume absolute control over the other. Our Saviour recognized the rights of both Church and State when he said, "Render therefore to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." But the Church, while always maintaining the principles that where a clear case of conflict between divine and human authority occurs, we must obey God rather than man, yet has defined the relation of Church and State in different ways. It was the dream of *Hildebrand* to establish a universal theocracy, and from his time the Church began to encroach on the legitimate rights of the State. Examples need not be given where the Pope claimed the right, not only to put kings under the ban, but to absolve subjects from their allegiance (what our Saviour Himself did not do in regard to Cæsar), and authorize any power from other nations to come in and dispossess the king.* Now the figure of the two lights, the sun and the moon, was used to illustrate the relation of the two, and then again the figure of the two swords, as in the case of the Bull of Boniface VIII., called *Unam*

* Innocent III., in the case of King John of England, A. D. 1212.

Sanetam, to which Dr. Döllinger refers in his reply to the Archbishop of Munich. “ *Unam sanctam Ecclesiam Catholica-
cam et ipsam Apostolicam urgente fide credere cogimur et
tenere. Igitur Ecclesiae unius et unicæ unum corpus, unum
caput, non duo capita, quasi monstrum, Christus videlicet et
Christi Vicarius Petrus, Petriique successor.* In hac ejusque
potestate duos esse gladios, spiritualem et temporalem, Evan-
gelicis dictis instruimur. Nam dicentibus Apostolis ‘Ecce
gladii duo hic,’ in Ecclesia scilicet: cum Apostoli loquerentur,
non respondit Dominus, nimis esse, sed satis. Uterque ergo
est in potestate Ecclesiae, spiritualis, scil. gladius, et mate-
rialis,” * etc. Must it be claimed that this interpretation of
Scripture, of the instance of Peter’s using the sword, is infal-
lible? And that as a consequence the Church is authorized to
hold and use two swords, a spiritual and a material one? This
must follow from the decision on Papal infallibility. But Döl-
linger demurs. He will not be committed to the infallibility of
Papal Bulls, for they may err.

This is an interesting question, and it is undergoing a new historical trial in the new conflict between Romanism, in this latest phase of its development, and some of the States of Europe. The Old Catholics are determined to maintain their loyalty to the king as well as to the Church. The new conditions under which the question is being tried particularly in Germany and Italy may lead to new revelations on this subject.

Some would have it that the only way out of this labyrinth is the adoption of the American theory. In this country Church and State are independent, it is usually said. Yet this must be qualified, for there are points on which they come together even here, as for instance in the case of the oath, of marriage, of keeping the Christian Sabbath, and in the matter of education. In reference to this last we are just coming to face some of the difficulties involved in the question of Church and State. These difficulties cannot be overcome by the State taking under its control the matter of religious edu-

* Gieseler, translated from the third edition, Vol. II. p. 246, note 25.

cation, for the State was never commissioned to teach Christianity,—nor by any attempt to deprive the State of all right to educate in any sense,—nor yet, as it would seem, by each doing its own work entirely separate. Perhaps we are in a better condition to meet these difficulties from the fact that we are not troubled by the complicated traditions of the past, as in the case of the States of Europe.

But those European States have a problem of their own here, which has been upon them for centuries, and they must meet it from their own position. One thing we think history has settled, viz: that the Roman Church will never again rule over civil governments as she has done in the past. In the new adjustment of the relation between the two, which Europe is now struggling to make, it will be found, we think, that old things have passed away never to return.

These are some of the points which are considered with great ability in the following papers in this *Review*. The whole question, we may add, is none the less interesting because it lies within the domain of *Roman History*. There are those who take little interest in the question here brought forward, because it is something different from the dispute between Romanism and Protestantism, as this meets us in the Reformation. They say, this Old Catholic movement cannot work out any results because it does not start with the Protestant principle. It is not just a Protestant movement. But this betrays, it seems to us, a narrow spirit. The Roman Church has continued for three centuries since the Reformation, to be the larger portion, numerically, of Christendom. No one with a right historical sense and knowledge can look upon such a movement within that Church with indifference. The whole problem of Christianity is not confined to Protestantism. The question of Church union looks to something more than the mere uniting of a few Protestant denominations, (sometimes brought about in order to constitute a larger sect, and, as a result, to intensify the sectarian spirit), or, indeed, all of them. It is a matter of interest to look beyond this, and hope for a union which will bring Christendom together as a whole. We

do not say this Old Catholic movement will effect this as a result, but it unquestionably brings this before our view. The manner in which Döllinger and his colleagues speak of Protestantism evinces a spirit of catholicity which we do not find in Ultramontane, or Papal-infallibility Romanism.

The movement is all the more important, in some respects, because it has this sense of an independent mission, because it is not a mere repetition of the Reformation of the 16th century. Gladly as we might hail a movement of the German Catholic Church towards Protestantism, yet such a movement would involve the solution of no new problem. It would strengthen Protestantism, but it would do nothing for Romanism as a whole, nor for the nearer approach of the two.

In this movement the Roman Church is confronted again, and under new circumstances (and, may we not say that Protestantism is in like manner challenged) with the question of the relation of authority and freedom? It is easy to see that there are difficulties on the Protestant side. This *Review* has not shrunk from holding them up to view. The evils of sectarianism and private judgment, where the principle of individual liberty is carried to excess, were pointed out in an earnest manner in its earlier numbers (as also in Dr. Schaff's Principle of Protestantism), when it was regarded as being untrue to the Protestant faith to do so. Times have changed during the last thirty years. The American Churches acknowledge the divided condition of Protestantism as an evil, and the tendency is setting in towards union. So, too, it is more generally acknowledged now that private judgment is not the only factor in the interpreting of the truth, and the living traditions of the Church in her creeds and confessions are respected far beyond what was the case a quarter of a century ago.

But from the beginning this *Review* has also presented the difficulties on the other side. If the consideration of those difficulties has not as frequently occupied its pages, it has been because it was more concerned to correct our own faults, in the public to whom it was addressed, than the faults of a communion to whom it was not directly addressed. But Mercers-

burg theology uttered a clear voice in reference to the wrongs which Romanism inflict on the freedom of reason and conscience and faith in the able discussion between Dr. Nevin and Dr. Brownson in 1850. These great thinkers stand in the same relative attitude to-day. Dr. Brownson, with what seems to us a giving up of some of his old freedom in criticising his own Church, and an advance in his surrender to the Roman principle, stands on the extreme position of Papal infallibility. Dr. Nevin, with unswerving devotion to the truth, in the face of misrepresentation from every side, stands as unswervingly for the truth he so nobly defended then. We commend to the attention of our readers his utterances on one of the great questions of the age.

**ART. II.—FIRST DOGMATIC DECREE ON THE CHURCH OF
CHRIST PUBLISHED IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE
HOLY ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN.**

PASSED JULY 18, 1870.

**PIVS EPISCOPVS SERVVS SERVORVM DEI SACRO APPROBANTE CON-
CILIO AD PERPETVAM REI MEMORIAM.**

Pastor aeternus et episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutiferum redemptionis opus perenne redderet, sanctam aedificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in qua veluti in domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et charitatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis qui credituri erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes, unum essent, sicut ipse Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre; ita in Ecclesia sua Pastores et Doctores usque ad consummationem saeculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohaerentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium

multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum caeteris Apostolis praeponens in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundatum, super cuius fortitudinem, aeternum extrueretur tempus, et Ecclesiae coelo inferenda sublimitas in suis fidei firmitate consurget.* Et quoniam portae inferi ad evertendam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam contra eius fundatum divinitus positum maiori in dies odio undique insurgunt; Nos ad catholici gregis custodiam, incolumitatem, augmentum, necessarium esse indicamus, sacro approbante Concilio, doctrinam de institutione, perpetuitate, ac natura sacri Apostolici primatus, in quo totius Ecclesiae vis ac soliditas consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam, secundum antiquam atque constantem universalis Ecclesiae fidem, proponere, atque contrarios, dominico gregi adeo perniciosos errores proscribere et condemnare.

CAPUT I.

DE APOSTOLICI PRIMATUS IN BEATO PETRO INSTITUTIONE.

Docemus itaque et declaramus, iuxta Evangelii testimonia primatum iurisdictionis in universam Dei Ecclesiam immediate et directe beato Petro Apostolo promissum atque collatum a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum enim Simonem, cui iam pridem dixerat: Tu vocaberis Cephas,† postquam ille suam edidit confessionem inquiens: Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi, solemnibus hic verbis locutus est Dominus: Beatus es Simon Bar-Iona, quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi sed Pater meus, qui in coelis est: et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam: et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum: et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in coelis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in coelis.‡ Atque uni Simoni Petro contulit Iesus post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris iurisdictionem in totum suum ovile, dicens: Pasce agnos meos: Pasce oves meas.§ Huic

* S. Leo M. serm. iv. (al. iii.) cap. 2, in d' em Natalis sui.

† Joan. 1: 42. ‡ Matt. 16: 16—19. § Joan. 21: 15—17.

tam manifestae sacrarum Scripturarum doctrinae, ut ab Ecclesia catholica semper intellecta est, aperte opponuntur pravae eorum sententiae, qui constitutam a Christo Domino in sua Ecclesia regiminis formam pervertentes negant, solum Petrum praeceteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque iurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum: aut qui affirmant eumdem primatum non immediate, directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesiae, et per hanc illi, ut ipsius Ecclesiae ministro, delatum fuisse.

Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesiae militantis visible caput; vel eumdem honoris tantum, non autem verae propriaeque iurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Iesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit.

CAPUT II.

DE PERPETUITATE PRIMATUS BEATI PETRI IN ROMANIS PONTIFICIBUS.

Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro princeps pastorum et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Iesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesia instituit, id eodem auctore in Ecclesia, quae fundata super petram ad finem saeculorum usque firma stabit, iugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane dubium, imo saeculis omnibus notum est quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiae catholicae fundamentum, a Domino nostro Iesu Christo, Salvatore humani generis ac Redemptore, claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctae Romanae Sedis, ab ipso fundatae, eiusque consecratae sanguine, vivit et praesidet et iudicium exercet.* Unde quicumque in hac Cathedra Petro succedit, is secundum Christi ipsius institutionem primatum Petri in universam Ecclesiam obtinet. Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in accepta fortitudine petrae perseverans suscepta Ecclesiae

* *Cat. Ephesini Concilii Act. iii.*

gubernacula non reliquit.* Hac de causa ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiores principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles, ut in ea Sede, e qua venerandae communionis iura in omnes diminant, tamquam membra in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent. †

Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsis Christi Domini institutione seu iure divino, ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat perpetuos successores; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem; anathema sit.

CAPUT III.

DE VI ET RATIONE PRIMATUS ROMANI PONTIFICIS.

Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum litterarum testimoniosis et inhaerentes tum Praedecessorum nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis, perspicuisque decretis, innovamus oecumenici Concilii Florentini definitiōnem, qua credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesia caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse; quemadmodum etiam in gestis oecumenicorum Conciliorum et sacris canonibus continetur.

Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam disponente Domino super omnes alias ordinariae potestatis obtainere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis iurisdictionis potestatem, quae vere episcopal is est, immediatam esse: erga quam cuiuscumque ritus et dignitatis, pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchiae subordinationis veraeque obedientiae obstringuntur, non solum in rebus,

* S. Leo. M. Sem. iii. (al. ii.) cap. 3.

† S. Iren. Adv. Haer. I, iii. c. 3. Ep. Cone. Aquileia. 381, inter epp. S. Ambros. ep. xi.

quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae, per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; ita, ut custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis, quam eiusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesia Christi sit unus grex sub uno summo pastore. Haec est catholicae veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare salva fide atque salute nemo potest.

Tantum autem abest, ut haec Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinarie ac immediatae illi episcopali iurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tamquam veri Pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universalii pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni: *Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesia. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur.**

Porro ex supra illa Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam ius eidem esse consequitur, in huius sui muneric exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totus Ecclesiae, ut iidem ab ipso in via salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitatis cum pastoribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eamdem reddunt saeculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quae ab Apostolica Sede vel eius auctoritate ad regimen, Ecclesiae constituantur, vim ac valorem non habere, nisi potestatis saecularis placito confirmentur.

Et quoniam divino Apostolici primatus iure Romanus Pontifex universae Ecclesiae praeest, docemus etiam et declaramus eum esse iudicem supremum fidelium,† et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse iudicium recurri;‡ Sedis vero Apostolicae, cuius auctoritate maior non est, iudicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de eius licere iudicare iudicio. § Quare a recto veritatis tramite

* Ep. ad. Eulog. Alexandrin. l. viii. ex. xxx.

† Pli P. VI. Breve Super Solidate, d. 28. Nov. 1786.

‡ Concil. Oecum. Lugdun. II.

§ Ep. Nicolai I. ad Michaelem Imperatorem.

aberrant, qui affirmant, licere ab iudiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad oecumenicum Concilium tamquam ad auctoritatem Romano Pontifici superiorem appellare.

Si quis itaque dixerit Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem iurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem huius supremae potestatis; aut hanc eius potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles; anathema sit.

CAPUT IV.

DE ROMANI PONTIFICIS INFALLIBILI MAGISTERIO.

Ipso autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex tamquam Petri principis Apostolorum successor in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendi, haec Sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiae usus comprobat, ipsaque oecumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Oriens cum Occidente in fidei charitatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, maiorum vestigiis inhaerentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem: *Prima salus est, rectae fidei regulam custodire.* Et quia non potest Domini nostri Iesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam,* haec, quae dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolica immaculata est semper catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab huius ergo fide et doctrina separari minime cupientes, speramus ut in una communione, quam Sedes Apostolica praedicat, esse mereamur, in qua est *integra et vera Christianae religionis soliditas.** Approbante vero Lugdunenis Concilio secundo, Graeci professi sunt: *Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam*

* Ex formula S. Hormisdas Papae, prout ab Hadriano II. Patribus Concilii Oecumenie VIII., Constantinopolitani IV., proposita et ab iisdem subscripta est.

summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipso Domino in beato Petro Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cuius Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit; et sicut prae caeteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, si quae de fide subortae fuerint quaestiones, suo debent iudicio definiri. Florentinum denique Concilium definit: Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro passendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Iesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.

Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Praedecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes terrae populos propagaretur, parique cura vigilarunt, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites, nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquae regulae formam sequentes, ea praesertim pericula, quae in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum resarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum.* Romani autem Pontifices, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocatis oecumenicis Conciliis aut explorata Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae sententia, nunc per Synodos particulares, nunc aliis, quae divina suppeditabat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda definiverunt, quae sacris Scripturis et apostolicis Traditionibus consentanea, Deo adiutore, cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum quidem apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti Doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri divinam pollicitationem dis-

* Cf. S. Bern. Epist. 190.

cipulorum suorum principi factam: Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos.

Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei numquam deficientis charisma Petro eiusque in hac Cathedra successoribus divinitus collatum est, ut excuso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosa esca aversus, coelestis doctrinae pabulo nutriretur, ut sublata schismatis occasione Ecclesia tota una conservaretur atque suo fundamento innixa firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

At vero cum hac ipsa aetate, qua salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur, qui illius actoritati obtrectant; necessarium omnino esse censemus, praerogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastorali officio coniugere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christiane exordio perceptae fideliter inhaerendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam religionis Catholicae exaltationem et Christianorem populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistantiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esso voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse.

Si quis autem huic Nostrae definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat, praesumpserit; anathema sit.

Datum Romae, in publica Sessione in Vaticana Basilica solemniter celebrata, anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die decima octava Iulii.

Pontificatus Nostri anno vigesimo quinto.

Ita est IOSEPHUS,

Episcopus S. Hippolyti Secretarius Concilii Vaticani.

ART. III.—DR. DÖLLINGER'S REPLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF MUNICH.

TRANSLATED BY PROF. J. S. STAHL, A. M.

YOUR Excellency has requested me in two letters to define my position with respect to the Roman resolutions of July 18th, 1870, which you have published.

The report comes from your Cathedral Chapter that you intend to proceed against me with such penal measures as are directed only against priests who are guilty of gross immorality, and even against these only in rare cases. This is to come to pass if I do not, within a certain period, announce my submission to the two new articles of faith touching the absolute power and infallibility of the Pope.

At the same time I learn that another convocation and council of the German Bishops will soon be held at Fulda.

When in the year 1848 a meeting of all the German Bishops was held at Würzburg, I received the honor of an invitation, and took part in the proceedings. Your Excellency could perhaps arrange that at the meeting soon to be held, I may be allowed, not to take part in the proceedings, but to have a few hours' audience before the Bishops.

I make this request because I am prepared to prove before this meeting the following theses, which might prove of decisive importance in the present condition of the German Church, as well as for my personal position.

First: The new articles of faith are professedly based on the following Scripture texts: Matt. xvi. 18, John xxi. 17; and infallibility particularly on Luke xxii. 32, with which this dogma, so far as Scripture proof is concerned, stands or falls. But now we are bound by a solemn oath, which I have myself taken twice, "to accept and interpret the Holy Scriptures only ac-

cording to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." The Church Fathers all, without exception, explained the texts in question, in a sense entirely different from the new decrees, and found particularly in the text Luke xxii. 32, anything else rather than infallibility granted to all the Popes. I would accordingly commit perjury, if I were to accept the decrees with this explanation, and without it, they have no Biblical basis whatever. As I have said, I am prepared to prove this before the assembled Bishops.

Secondly : In several pastoral letters and proclamations recently published, the assertion has been made, and historical proof attempted, that the new doctrine promulgated in Rome of the absolute power of the Pope over every individual Christian, and of papal infallibility in doctrinal decisions, has been believed and taught in the Church from the beginning through the succeeding centuries down to the present time, with universal or almost universal consent. This assertion rests, as I am prepared to prove, upon an utter misconception of the tradition of the Church during the first thousand years, and a perversion of her history. It is in direct conflict with the plainest facts and testimonies.

Thirdly : I offer further to prove that the Bishops of the Romanic countries, Spain, Italy, South America and France, who constituted the immense majority in Rome, together with their clergy, were led astray by their text-books already from which they obtained their information during their seminary training, with respect to the subject of papal power, since the proofs given in these books are for the most part spurious, invented or distorted. I shall prove this as true first of the two principal works and favorite text-books of the modern Theological Schools and Seminaries, *The Modern Theology of S. Alphonso Liguori* (particularly of the included Tract on the Pope), and *The Theology of the Jesuit Perroni*; secondly of the writings of Archbishop Cardoni and Bishop Ghilardi, distributed at the time of the Council in Rome, and finally, of The Theology of the Viennese Theologian Schwetz.

Fourthly : I appeal to the fact, and offer to prove publicly,

that two General Councils and several Popes decided as early as in the fifteenth century by solemn decrees published by the Councils and confirmed by the Popes, repeatedly, the question of the extent of the Pope's powers and of his infallibility, and that the decrees of July 18th, 1870, are in glaring contradiction to these resolutions, and therefore cannot possibly be binding.

Fifthly: I believe I am able to prove that the new decrees are utterly incompatible with the Constitutions of the European States, especially of Bavaria, and that in consequence of the oath to support this constitution which I have but lately taken again on my entrance into the Chamber of "Reichsräthe," I cannot possibly accept the new decrees, and their necessary consequence, the Bulls *Unam Sanctam* and *Cum ex apostolatus officio*, the Syllabus of Pius IX., and so many other papal declarations and laws which are now claimed to be infallible, and are in irreconcilable conflict with the laws of the country. I appeal on this subject to the opinion of the Legal Faculty in Munich, and promise at the same time to abide by the decision of any German Legal Faculty which your excellency may be pleased to name.

I make only two conditions for the conference which I have proposed, or rather for which I have asked; first, that my statements with the replies that may be made, be recorded, and permission granted to have them subsequently published. Secondly, that permission be given to a man of scientific culture, chosen by me for this purpose, to be present at the conference.

If this should be unattainable in Fulda and before the German Bishops, then I venture most respectfully to present a different request. May your Excellency please to form the members of your chapter into a Committee before which I may plead my cause in the way proposed above. Several of these venerable gentlemen are Doctors, and were previously Professors of Theology as well as my former scholars. I cherish the hope that it will be much more agreeable to them to engage in a calm discussion with me, to confute me if possible, with facts and arguments, than to sit upon the judgment-seat and frame

spiritual sentences of condemnation against me, and to submit them to your Excellency for the purpose of fulmination, as it is called. If your Excellency will consent to preside at this Conference, and condescend to set me right with respect to any error that I may have committed in the citation and interpretation of proof and facts, I shall consider it a great honor, and the cause of truth can only gain thereby. And if you hold the exercise of your pastoral power in suspense over me, I still cherish the hope that you will prefer to exercise towards me in the first place the noblest, the most beautiful, the most beneficial attribute of this power—that which most resembles Christ—the teacher's office. I hereby promise publicly to retract everything that I have written on this subject and to confute myself, if I am convinced with facts and the testimony of good authorities. In any case the result must necessarily be advantageous to the Church, and the peace of souls. For it is not I alone who am personally concerned in this matter. Thousands among the clergy, hundreds of thousands among the laity, think as I do, and find it impossible to accept the new articles of faith. Up to this day, not a single one of those even who have declared their submission, has told me that he was really convinced of the truth of these articles. All my friends and acquaintances assert that they experience the same thing. "Not a single person believes in it" is what I hear every day from all sides. A conference like the one which I have proposed, and the publication of the proceedings, will therefore in my case afford that deeper insight for which so many long.

Your Excellency will perhaps refer me to the Pastoral Letter which recently appeared over your signature, as a source from which I can draw the necessary information and correction of my opinion; but I must confess that its effect upon me has been exactly the opposite, and I am prepared to prove that we have in it a long list of testimonies and proofs which are misunderstood, distorted, mutilated or invented, and which in connection with the suppression of important facts and counter-proofs present a picture utterly unlike the genuine tradition. No doubt the person to whom your Excellency entrusted this task, did

not himself commit these forgeries, but borrowed them in good faith from others (from Cardoni and others); should he however be desirous of defending his work before the proposed conference, he will find me ready in a few hours to establish my assertion, or, failing in this, publicly to apologize. In view of the great importance of the matter, I feel constrained to make a single condition; viz: that the government be requested to appoint one of its officers conversant with historical and ecclesiastical affairs to attend the conference. As the matter is of the utmost importance to all governments it may be assumed that the State would not refuse this request.

Facts are not wanting in the past history of the Church to show that my proposition is in accordance with the principles as well as the practice of the Church. In the year 411, for example, a conference of two hundred and eighty-six Catholic and Donatist Bishops was held in three sessions under the presidency of an imperial officer Marcellinus, and the disputed doctrine of the Church was discussed, wherenupon the latter decided in favor of the Catholic Bishops. In the year 1433 Bohemian Calixtines appeared at the council of Basle; a decree concerning the communion in one kind, which had been promulgated eighteen years before at the Synod of Constance, was now subjected to new discussion and examination, and the result was the famous compacts which, acknowledged by the Papal chair, formed a very important and significant concession to the Bohemians, deviating materially from the original decree. Resembling still more closely the method of procedure which I have proposed, is a conference widely celebrated in French history between the Bishop Du Perron of Evreux and the Protestant statesman and scholar Du Plessis Mornay, which was held in the year 1600 at Fontainebleau under the auspices of King Henry IV. The point at issue was to prove that Mornay in his book on the Eucharist had falsified or incorrectly quoted a considerable number of authorities. Henry presided in person, and the most eminent men of both churches were present as witnesses. After a few days, and after a number of Mornay's quotations had been examined, the conference was

interrupted by the illness of the latter, but produced a remarkably favorable effect for the Catholic cause in the excited minds of that period.

Most reverend Archbishop! I leave it entirely to your discretion what form you will give to the conference which I desire and which must certainly prove welcome to multitudes of German Catholics, or what persons you will invite to attend the conference or oppose me. There is certainly no want of professional theologians in your Diocese who will be glad to accept your invitation. The practice of the Church proves, and Popes and theologians have acknowledged the fact that a doctrinal question is just as much a matter of concern to the laity as to the clergy, and that the former have a right to take part in the scientific examination and establishment of tradition. And here, where we have to do with a question of historical proof, I willingly subject myself to the judgment of the most eminent historians of the German nation and of the Catholic faith. Men like Ficker, Reumont, Höfler, Arneth, Kampschulte, Cornelius, Lorenz, Wegele and Aschbach shall judge whether my proof is critically and historically correct or not.

Your Excellency was formerly pleased to honor my book on the first or apostolic ages of the Church with your approval, and in Germany it is generally considered by Catholics a faithful representation of the founding of the Church; no answer worth mentioning has ever come from the Jesuitic Ultramontane party. But if the new decrees are true then I stand convicted of having entirely misrepresented the history of the apostles. The whole section of my book which treats of the constitution of the primitive Church, my representation of the relation in which Paul and the other apostles stood to Peter, is then fundamentally wrong, and I would be obliged to condemn my own book, and acknowledge that I have neither understood Luke's Acts of the Apostles nor the Apostolic Epistles.

The new Vatican doctrine invests the Pope with plenary power (*totam plenitudinem potestatis*) over the whole Church as well as over every individual layman, priest or bishop—a power which is to be considered at one and the same time as truly

episcopal, as well as specifically papal, which is to comprehend everything touching upon faith, morals, duty and discipline, which shall lay hold of any one immediately, the monarch as well as the day-laborer, to punish, command or forbid, as the occasion may seem to require. The wording is carefully so arranged, that there remains for the bishops absolutely no other position and authority than that of papal commissaries and plenipotentiaries. In this way then, as every one acquainted with history and the Fathers will admit, the episcopacy of the Old Church is dissolved in its inmost essence, and an apostolic institution to which, according to the judgment of the Fathers, greatest significance and authority in the Church attaches, is dissipated into a shadow without a substance. For every one will see at a glance the absurdity of having two bishops in the same Diocese, one who is at the same time Pope, and the other simply a bishop; and a papal vicar or diocesan commissary is not a bishop, not a successor of the Apostles. He may be very powerful on account of the powers conferred by Rome, so long as his principal allows him to rule, just as a Jesuit or mendicant friar whom the Pope has endowed with abundant privileges is also very powerful, and I know very well that this prospect of an increase of power has been held out to the bishops in Rome, that they have often been told: "The more irresistible the Pope is, the stronger you shall be, for the plenitude of his power shall shed rich beams upon you." The bishops of the minority clearly discerned the delusion of these promises; as the "Analytical Synopsis" shows, they clearly recognized the fact that if the universal episcopate of the Pope should be established, they would indeed still be dignitaries of the Church, but by no means bishops in the true sense of the word. You yourself, most reverend Sir, had part in the deputations which made the most urgent remonstrances to the Pope on the 15th of July, remonstrances which Herr von Ketteler tried to make more emphatic by prostrating himself before the Pope. It is well known that these remonstrances were in vain. The only consolation offered to the Prelates who mourned the loss of their old ecclesiastical dignity, was confined to a declara-

tion in the decree to the effect that the authority of a bishop is "ordinary" (i. e. a '*potestas ordinaria subdelegata*,' as the Roman canonists are accustomed to call it), and that the Pope considers it his duty to support this authority, in proof of which a mutilated passage from Gregory the Great was cited—a passage which, if quoted in full together with others of similar import, would really have proved to the world that this Pope of the seventh century rejected such a universal episcopate, in its present form, with the deepest horror, as a blasphemous usurpation.

In general there was no lack of prayers, representations and warnings before and during the Council. You yourself, most reverend sir, took part by attaching your signature to the same. The bishops of the minority on the 12th of January in an address to the Pope signed also by you, declared: "The declarations and acts of the Fathers of the Church, the *genuine* documents of history, and the Catholic system of doctrine itself present serious difficulties in opposition to the proclamation of the doctrine of Infallibility." At that time they were frightened, as they themselves say, at the prospect of discussing these difficulties, and prayed the Pope not to impose upon them the necessity of such a discussion, i. e. to relinquish the dogma of his infallibility. But when the Pope insisted that the Council should act upon this subject, the German Bishops on the 11th of March demanded exhaustive conferences on the question of infallibility which should be conducted by chosen deputations from both sides. These were not granted, and nothing more was allowed than speeches in the Aula, where all regular discussion was utterly impossible.

I will here cite only one instance to show how indispensable, and urgently necessary such exhaustive conferences were. A considerable number of Italian Bishops in an address that has since been printed demanded that papal infallibility should be established as a dogma because two men who were both Italians and the pride of their nation, Thomas Aquinas and Alphonso Liguori, two brilliant lights of the Church, had so taught. Now it was well known, as I as well as Gratry had previously

pointed out, that Thomas had been deceived by a long series of invented proofs, as indeed he supports his doctrine on this subject throughout only by references to such forgeries and not by genuine quotations from the Fathers or the Councils. And as far as Liguori is concerned, a single glance at his writings suffices to convince a practiced theologian that he dealt in forged passages still more largely than Thomas. My exposure of the fraud of which Thomas was a victim had created a great sensation in Rome. The author of a pamphlet written in Rome at that time and directed against me, says that a great cry was raised on the subject on every side. This should have made it absolutely necessary to examine into the matter. Such an examination if it had been made comprehensive and thorough would it is true have led very far ; it would have resulted in establishing the fact that the theory of papal infallibility was introduced into the Church only by a long series of deliberate inventions and forgeries, and that it was afterwards spread and maintained by force, by the suppression of the old doctrine, and by the manifold means and artifices which are always at the disposal of the ruling power. Thus all efforts, representations, and prayers were in vain ; no concessions were made even with the example of the Council of Florence, otherwise so often quoted, before their eyes, where the assertion of the Greeks that falsified passages of the Fathers were laid before them led to examinations and discussions that lasted for months and were conducted with the greatest care. Your Excellency certainly knows that whenever a true *Œcumene* Council was about to adopt dogmatic resolutions, the ripest and most careful examination of tradition was considered an indispensable condition of their validity. And how great is the contrast in this respect between the mode of procedure at Trent, and that adopted in Rome in 1870 ! Most assuredly the treatise of Archbishop Cardoni, which had already been accepted by the Preparatory Committee, and was now to be regarded as proof by the assembled Bishops, could not have borne an examination even for an hour.

In the whole history of the Church, I know of only one General Council in which those in authority prevented, as they did

in the late Council, all thorough discussion of tradition, and this was the Second of Ephesus held in 479; there in the so-called Robber Synod this was done by violence and tumultuous tyranny; in the Vatican Council, it was the method of procedure imposed upon the assembly, the papal committees and the will of the majority that suffered no regular or thorough examination to be made. Such an examination would undoubtedly have brought many serious and unpleasant matters to light; but it would also have preserved the Church from a state of confusion which even you consider lamentable. If now you nevertheless assert that the Vatican Council was entirely free, you must use the word "free" in a different sense from that which it ordinarily bears in theological circles. A Council is only then theologically free, when all exceptions and difficulties have been freely examined, and discussed, when all objections have been admitted and tested by the rules necessary for ascertaining the teachings of tradition. That not even the smallest beginning was made in this direction, that in fact the immense majority of Bishops from the Romanic countries lacked either the inclination or the ability to discern truth from falsehood, right from wrong, is proved by the pamphlets which appeared in Italy and were distributed in Rome, as for example those of the Dominican, Ghilardi, Bishop of Mondovi; and still further by the fact that hundreds of these Bishops could, without blushing, appeal to the unimpeachable authority of Alphonso Liguori.

It is well known that the Jesuits, when they determined to establish papal absolutism in Church and State, in doctrine and administration as a dogma, invented the so-called "*sacrificio dell' intelletto*," and assured their adherents and disciples, and really convinced many, among others even bishops, that the most beautiful act of reverence to God, and the noblest Christian heroism consists in this: that man, renouncing his own spiritual light of self-acquired knowledge and understanding, should throw himself with blind faith into the arms of an unerring papal authority as the only sure source of religious knowledge. This Order has indeed succeeded to a great extent

in exalting intellectual indolence in the eyes of multitudes to the dignity of a meritorious religious sacrifice, thus inducing men to waive historical examination, whose culture in other respects well qualified them to enter upon such a work. But the German Bishops, so far as we can judge in this respect from their pastoral letters, have after all not yet arrived at this stage of delusion. They grant certain rights and a sphere of activity also to science, to rational examination and investigation. They themselves appeal to history, as does also the pastoral letter which has appeared under your name.

In a pastoral letter of Bishop Lothar von Kübel in Freiburg, which I have just received, we read on page nine: "Does the Pope receive new revelations? Can he *create new articles of faith*? Certainly not. He can only declare that a given doctrine is contained in the Holy Scriptures and tradition, that it is therefore revealed by God, and must be believed by all." I do not doubt that your Excellency and all the other German Bishops fully assent to these words. If this be so, then we have to do, in the present confused state of the Church, with a purely historical question, and one which must be treated and decided upon only by the means which we have in our possession for this purpose, and according to the rules which apply to all historical research, the discovery of all past, that is historical, facts. There are in this case no special secret sources from which the Popes alone have the right or power to draw. The Pope and the Bishops must here necessarily place themselves, if we may use the expression, under the authority of the common law; that is, if their conclusions are to have any weight, they must apply that mode of procedure, undertake that examination of witnesses, with the necessary sifting and critical tests, which is alone able to give us truth and certainty, according to the common consent of men of all ages and nations who are capable of forming a judgment in historical matters. It was, therefore, and still is necessary to answer two questions in this way. First: Is it true that the three declarations of Christ concerning Peter have been understood in the whole Church, from the beginning through all the intervening centuries to the

present time, in the sense which is now put into them, namely as granting infallibility and absolute universal power to all the Popes? Secondly: Is it true that the tradition of the Church in all ages proves the general acknowledgment of this double right of the Pope, in the writings of the Fathers, and the facts of history?

If these questions must be answered in the negative, it will not do to rely as Bishop von Kübel and others do, on the assistance of the Holy Ghost, assured, as they say, to the Pope, and appeal to the obedience of faith due to him on this account: for the very question to be historically proved, is, whether such assistance is really vouchsafed to him. And where has this been done up to the present time? Not in the Council, for there, as Cardoni's principal treatise proves, even forgeries were resorted to, and an utterly false representation of tradition was made with a suppression of the most striking facts and testimonies on the other side. And this is the very point which I offer to prove.

And at this point I beg your Excellency to consider that the doctrine which we are now expected to adopt, is, in the nature of the case, according to the declaration of the Pope himself and the admission of all advocates of infallibility, *a*, or rather, *the fundamental article of faith*; that we have to do here directly with the *regula fidei*, the regulative norm which decides what is, and what is not to be believed. In future every Catholic Christian, if asked why he believes this or that, could only answer: "I believe or reject it, because the infallible Pope has commanded me to believe or reject it." This first principle of faith, as it must on this supposition have been revealed in the Holy Scriptures as clear as the sun, can never have become darkened in the Church; in all ages, and among all nations it must have governed the whole Church, and stood in the front rank of all instruction; and we still all wait to have it explained how the Church only after 1830 years hit upon the thought of making a dogma of a doctrine which the Pope in a letter addressed to your Excellency under date of Oct. 28th, calls *ipsum fundamentale principium catholicae fidei ac doctrinae*.

How was it at all possible that the Popes should for centuries indulge whole countries, whole schools of theology in denying this fundamental article? And where was then the unity of the Church, if there was a division in the very foundation of faith? And—may I add?—why was it that your Excellency yourself struggled so long and persistently against the proclamation of this dogma? Because it was not opportune, you say. But can it ever be 'inopportune' to give to believers the key to the whole temple of faith, to proclaim the fundamental article on which all the others depend? Here we stand in very truth giddy on the brink of an abyss which opened before us on the 18th of July.

If any one wishes to ascertain the far-reaching consequences of the late resolutions, let him faithfully compare together the third and fourth chapters of the Decree, and realize what a system of the most complete universal authority and spiritual dictatorship is here presented. Every Catholic is henceforth to recognize in his conduct and believe in plenary power over the entire Church as well as over every individual member, as it has been claimed by the Popes since Gregory VII. and expressed in the numerous Bulls since the Bull *Unam Sanctam*. This power is boundless, incalculable, it can make itself felt, as Innocent III. says, wherever there is sin, can punish any one, suffers no appeal, is arbitrary sovereignty; for, according to Bonifacius VIII. the Pope carries all rights in the shrine of his bosom. Since now he has become infallible, he can in one moment, with the little word "*orbi*" (*i. e.* addressing himself to the whole Church,) exalt any ordinance, doctrine, or demand into an infallible, indisputable article of faith. In opposition to him there can be no right, no personal or corporal freedom; or, as the canonists say: the tribunal of God and that of the Pope are one and the same. This system bears its Roman origin on its forehead, and it can never permeate the Germanic countries. *As a Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, as a citizen, I cannot accept this doctrine.* Not as a Christian; for it is incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel and the plain teachings of Christ and the Apostles; it aims to establish pre-

cisely that government over this world which Christ declined ; it demands that authority over the congregations which Peter forbade to others and to himself. Not as a theologian ; for the whole genuine tradition of the Church is in irreconcilable opposition to it. I cannot accept it as a historian ; for as such I know that the persistent endeavor to actualize this theory of absolute authority over the world has cost Europe rivers of blood, confounded and degraded whole countries, broken down the beautiful organic constitution of the primitive Church, produced, and fostered and maintained the worst abuses in the Church. As a citizen, finally, I must reject it ; because, by claiming submission to the papal power on the part of States, monarchs and the whole civil order, and an exceptional position for the clergy, it opens the way for endless, ruinous strife between Church and State, between clergy and laity. For I cannot conceal from myself the fact that this doctrine, the consequences of which were the destruction of the old German Empire, would, in case it should acquire the supremacy in the Catholic part of the German Nation, lay the seed of an incurable disease in the new Empire just established.*—Accept, &c.

I. VON DÖLLINGER.

Munich, March 28th, 1871.

* I have just read the following in the official organ of the Roman Curia and the Jesuits, the "Civiltà" of March 18, 1871, p. 664: "The Pope is supreme judge of all civil laws. In him the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, flow together as in a point ; for he is the Vicegerent of Christ who is not only the Eternal Priest but also King of kings and Lord of lords;" and immediately afterward : "The Pope is in virtue of his high dignity at the head of both powers."

ART. IV.—THE GERMAN BISHOPS AS WITNESSES OF THE TRUTH.

A Tract for the Time, composed from Authentic Documents, by a Catholic Priest, with the motto: *De ore tuo te judico.* Luke 19: 22.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN, BY THE REV. E. W. REINECKE, NAZARETH, PA.

I.

THE *Pastoral Letter* which bears date September 6th, 1869, and is addressed by the *German Bishops assembled at Fulda to the members of their dioceses*, is subscribed by the Archbishops of Cologne and Munich, by the Bishops of Breslau, Würzburg, Fulda, Mentz, Hildesheim, Paderborn, Augsburg, Treves, Osnabrück, Eichstädt, Ermland, Culm and Speyer, the Apostolic Vicars of Saxony and Luxemburg, the Capitular-Vicar of the Archdiocese of Freiburg, and the Bishop elect of Rottenburg. In this pastoral letter occur the following passages:

“Fears are expressed that the Council might, and no doubt would, proclaim *new* articles of faith, which are not contained in the revelation of God or the traditions of the Church; and also establish principles, which might be detrimental to the interests of Christianity and the Church, incompatible with the just claims of the State, with civilization and science, as also with the proper liberty and the temporal welfare of the peoples. This is not all: even the Holy Father is charged with intending under the influence of a party, to make use of the Council as a means of *raising unduly the power of the apostolic see*, of changing the old and genuine constitution of the Church, and of establishing a spiritual despotism incompatible with Christian liberty. . . . The suspicion is accordingly openly expressed, that an *untrammelled liberty of discussion* would not be granted to the German bishops, and that these bishops themselves

would be wanting in the erudition and courage indispensable to a proper discharge of their duties as members of the Council ; and, as a consequence of all this, even the validity of the Council and its conclusions are called in question."

"A General Council never will and never can proclaim a *new* doctrine, such as *is not contained in the Holy Scriptures or the apostolic traditions* ; as it is the practice of the Church, always indeed, when she gives an expression in matters of faith, not to proclaim new doctrines, but to set in a clearer light the old and original truth, and to defend it against new error."

"Rest assured, therefore, that the Council will not establish any new principles, nor any principles whatever, except those which *by faith and conscience have been written in all your hearts*, and which the Christian nations through all centuries have regarded as sacred."

"Nor need any one fear that the Council will, without due consideration and with undue haste, arrive at conclusions, which, without any necessity thereto compelling, stand in antagonism with existing circumstances and the requirements of the present age ; or that in the manner of fanatical men it will transplant into the present, views, customs and regulations of the past."

"In a Council of the Church it is not the custom for different *parties* to struggle with all the arts of persuasion for mere victory ; nor do individual members of it seek, *merely by securing a majority*, to gain ascendancy over opponents. . . Especially where the everlasting verities of faith are concerned, the Council will not determine even *the most trifling point*, without having previously exhausted all the resources of *science*, and of the *most mature consideration*."

"Nothing is so foreign and so opposed to the very essence of the Catholic Church, as party spirit. . . As Peter and the Apostles at the first Council at Jerusalem, were of *one* mind and all spoke *the same* language, so it will also be at this time ; and it will become manifest to the whole world, that, as in the first Christian congregation, so in the Catholic Church now also, all are of *one* heart and of *one* soul."

II.

In a pastoral letter, dated November 12th, 1869, Bishop Ketteler, of Mentz, says:

“Whether the next Council will establish any doctrinal decisions, and what may be their nature; whether, for instance the infallibility of the pope in matters of faith, and the extent of it, will be discussed, of this we are not informed. . . But one thing we do know with full certainty, that if these or similar doctrinal points should be acted upon, the approaching Council will, like all its predecessors, follow those *unalterable* and wise rules, which come from the Spirit who guides the Councils. . . The first rule for *all* decisions in matters of faith is, that the Church in her General Councils decides only such questions of faith as the circumstances of the age *necessitate* her to decide; the second is, that even in these decisions the Church must limit herself to that which is *necessary*; . . . The third, that such decisions are formed *not merely according to majorities*, but *according to the unanimity of the teachers of the Church as a whole.*”

“Such, no doubt, will also be the rules which shall guide the approaching Council; and if the Council shall give any decisions on points of faith, you may rest assured they will have been compelled to do so by the circumstances of the times, in order to maintain pure the doctrine of Jesus; and that such decisions will *have been reached either with an absolute unanimity of the assembled bishops, or, at least, with such a majority as will be the same as unanimity*; and that, above all, in these decisions the head and the members of the body of apostolical teachers, the pope and the bishops, will agree with indissoluble unity and in the most perfect manner.”

III.

The Bishop of Paderborn, in his “Text-book of the Catholic Religion,” (Lehrbuch der katholischen Religion), which was first published in 1844, and has been used under the sanction of the bishops in most of the German gymnasia, says:

“Among the apostles each was endowed individually with

infallibility in doctrine, since the work to which each of them was called required such an endowment. But the object for which Christ has bestowed infallibility upon the Church does not require that every individual successor of the apostles, every bishop, should be infallible in doctrine; for this purpose can be fully reached on this condition, that infallibility belongs to the successors of the apostles *as a whole*. Christ, therefore, with a view to the more perfect union of each to all, has so ordered, that *only the whole* can lay claim to this gift."

"Hence the successors of the apostles collectively taken, that is, the whole of the bishops in their subordination to the successor of St. Peter, the pope of Rome, form the Church in its capacity of infallible teacher."

"The way and manner in which the Church teaches infallibly, is various. Either the bishops, called together by the supreme head of the Church, assemble at an appointed place according to the precedent of the apostles (vid. Acts 15); where, after previous common consultation connected with religious solemnities, and under the presidency of the head or his vicar, they give decisive utterances on points of faith or morals; or the supreme head of the Church, in his capacity of guardian of the faith, gives alone such an utterance, *which subsequently obtains the expressed or silent consent of the remaining bishops* (ecclesia dispersa). In both cases the utterances given, or the conclusions arrived at, are infallible, *since they proceed from the whole teaching Church.*"

As late as the 13th edition, published in 1869, we read in § 191, as follows :

"Among the apostles each possessed individually the gift of infallibility, since the work, which each had to perform individually, required infallibility in doctrine. In post-apostolic times, however, only the *integral whole* of the true successors of the apostles, that is, the integral whole of the bishops in subordination to the pope, possesses this gift. *In this manner the expressions of the Holy Scriptures pertaining to the matter have been understood by the Church from the beginning*, and by means of this arrangement the union and communion of the

Church are strengthened as by another tie. The *bishops, collectively taken*, united and subordinate to the Roman pope, are therefore also called distinctively the teaching Church."

In the pastoral letter, published by the same bishop, *Martin of Paderborn*, during Lent, A. D. 1862, we read :

"The Church of Jesus Christ, *governed by Peter and the other apostles and their true successors*, is incapable of error and infallible in matters of religion. As regards the mere *power*, Christ could no doubt have imparted the gift of infallibility to every individual, instead of to His teaching Church *as a whole*. But such was not *His will, in order that the individual might not exalt himself*. . . For such and other reasons, therefore, Christ willed to impart the gift of infallibility not to each individual separately, but *only to his teaching Church as a whole*."

The Prince-bishop, *Forster of Breslau*, says in his sermons, published in 1843 ; (II. 50) :

"The teaching office bestowed by Christ upon His apostles is not infallible in its separate members, but infallible when it pronounces a decision *as a whole*. The promise was not given to the individual, for the individual does not constitute the Church, but only where her representatives are assembled in His name. Not to this or that elect one only does the Holy Ghost open the understanding of the divine word ; He remains as the universal and infallible teacher and comforter with His *Church* forever, and guides her into all truth, that so she may be the bearer of this divine truth for all ages and nations."

IV.

During the Council repeated complaints were made by many bishops concerning the order of business, which was established in an unfair way by the pope. A paper with reference to this matter, dated March 1st, 1870, and signed by more than one hundred prelates of different nations, was handed in to the presidents of the Council (printed in Friedrich's *Documenta*, I. 262.) Here we read :

"Let us be strictly governed by the traditional rule observed

by all the Ecumenical Councils, not to define points of faith by numerical majorities, but by *moral unanimity*. Pius IV. laid so much stress upon this at the Council of Trent, that in the case of an important point of doctrine, "he would have no definition established, unless it were unanimously adopted by the fathers." And this custom, in fact, is in full harmony with the noted saying of Vincentius Lerinensis: "What has been believed always, everywhere, and by all." And since catholic doctrine, as Bellarmine says, rests upon the *consent of the churches*, it follows, that the definition of doctrines by the councils requires a moral, unanimous consent of the fathers, who represent the Church. In the case of the Vatican Council it seems the more necessary to insist upon this rule, since so many fathers have been admitted to the privilege of voting, concerning whom it is by no means clear, whether the privilege belongs to them by divine right at all, and not simply by ecclesiastical right. . . ."

"As regards the number of votes necessary to the decision of a doctrinal question, we consider this as a point of such importance, that, if what we reverently and urgently ask for is not granted, *our conscience will be weighed down with an intolerable burden*. We would fear that the ecumenical character of the council might be questioned, that an opportunity might be given to opponents for attacks upon the holy see and the council, and that thus the authority of the council might be weakened among Christians, as if it had been neither true nor free; which would in these unsettled times be so great a calamity, that we can think of none worse."

V.

On the 10th of April, a paper drawn up by Cardinal *Rauscher*, and signed by a number of bishops, was handed in (printed in *Friedrich's Documenta*, II. 388,) in which we read:

"Since the popes of the Middle Ages, as was done at the time by even the most learned men, judged past times according to the norm of their own age, and were also misled by false reports concerning popes of former centuries, which were said

to have deposed emperors, they as a consequence firmly believed, and expressed their belief in decrees and rescripts, that God had invested them with the right of commanding and judging in all secular affairs with reference to what was sin; for that Christ, the Lord, had given to St. Peter and his successors two swords; the one spiritual, which they bore themselves; the other secular, which princes and soldiers had to bear according to their direction. This doctrine concerning the relation of the papal power to the secular was proclaimed by Boniface VIII., in the bull *Unam Sanctam*, and thus held up to all believers for their acceptance. There are some who, for the sake of removing the difficulty, assert that Boniface defined nothing more than, 'that all men were bound to acknowledge the Roman pope as head of the Church appointed by Christ.' But whoever knows what had taken place between Boniface and Philip the Fair, cannot be in doubt as regards the meaning of the pope, who published the bull at a synod called together with direct reference to the affairs of France. Regard for truth does not allow us to set aside what is evident, nor is it prudent; for he that makes use of such weapons, gives to the enemies of the Church the best pretext to defame her, and to reject even those testimonies of history, which are favorable to her. Besides, down to the seventeenth century the popes taught openly that the power over secular affairs had been conferred upon them by God, and they condemned the contrary opinion.

"A different doctrine concerning the relation of the spiritual to the secular power is proclaimed by us, and by nearly all the bishops of the catholic world, to the Christian nations. We teach namely, that the dignity of the two powers is indeed different; for just as heaven is higher than the earth, so also are the everlasting treasures, which are communicated to men by means of the spiritual power, higher than the temporal, to the preservation and increase of which the direct activity of the civil power confines itself; but that each of these two powers is, in the sphere entrusted to it, next to God, supreme, and not subject to the other in its special work; that the secular

prince, as [member of the Church, is subject to the authority of the Church, to which by divine appointment the power is given to inflict ecclesiastical penalties even upon emperors and kings, but by no means the power to depose them, and to absolve their subjects from their allegiance; that the power of judging kings and kingdoms, which the popes of the Middle Ages exercised, had accrued to them in consequence of a peculiar condition of national law; but that the foundation upon which it rested having been taken away by a thorough reconstruction of public institutions and private relations, it had itself also passed away.

“That which we teach concerning the relation of ecclesiastical to civil authority, is not new, but very old, and supported by the unanimous consent of the holy fathers, and by the utterances and precedents of all the popes to the time of Gregory VII. We do not therefore doubt that it is perfectly true; for God forbid, that on account of the distress of the times we should corrupt the true sense of the divine law. But it is necessary to point out the dangers that would threaten the Church from a decree, which should not agree with our teaching. No one is ignorant of the fact, that it is impossible to reconstruct civil society according to the norm established in the bull *Unam Sanctam*. But a change of human views (and institutions) can set aside neither a power conferred by God, nor the obligations involved in it. If the Roman pope, as successor of St. Peter, had really obtained the power represented by the two swords, and, so possessed by divine right, as is asserted in the bull *Cum ex Apostolatus officio*, plenipotentiary power over people and kingdoms, the Church would have no right to conceal this from believers; for she must walk in the footsteps of St. Paul, who tells those whom he had undertaken to teach: ‘I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.’ But if Christian instruction should be arranged in accordance with this, it would profit the Catholics but little to give the vague assurance: What regards the power of the holy see in temporal affairs, passes not beyond the boundaries of theory, and has now no significance whatever in reference to existing relations

and events; Pius IX. has not the remotest intention of deposing secular rulers. For the opponents would scornfully answer: 'We do not fear papal decisions; but after many and manifold prevarications it has now at last become manifest, that every Catholic, who acts according to the faith which he confesses, is a born enemy of the State, since he feels himself bound in conscience to do all he can to bring all kingdoms and nations into subjection to the Roman pope.' It is superfluous to point out the manifold calumnies and machinations, for which this would furnish occasion to the enemies of the Church.

"In these circumstances it cannot be a matter of doubt to him, who carefully looks at this difficulty, that it ought to be most carefully discussed, before we come to act on the infallibility of the pope. The deliberations asked for by us as early as the 11th of March, might contribute much towards clearing it up; but the question, whether Christ had conferred upon St. Peter and his successors power over kings and kingdoms, is especially in our times of such importance, that it requires to be laid before the Council in a direct manner, and to be carefully weighed and examined by it from all sides. It were not right to induce the fathers, without accurate and full knowledge of the matter, to decide a point, the consequences of which are so extensive, and come in such manifold and close contact with the relations of the Church to human society. This question, therefore, should be submitted to them for consideration, before the eleventh chapter of the *schema* concerning the Church—which refers to the infallibility of the pope—is taken in hand. If it is preferred, the question can be brought forward by itself; but inasmuch as it cannot be thoroughly considered, unless the relation of the ecclesiastical to the civil power is investigated from all sides, it seems to us best calculated for the purposes of truth, to act upon chapters 13 and 14, before taking up chapter 11th."

VI.

The request mentioned in No. 5, was not regarded; on the contrary it was decreed about the end of April, that, setting

aside all other subjects of consideration, including even those already partly acted upon, the papal infallibility should at once be made the order of the day. Against this 67 bishops protested in a paper to the president of the Council, dated May 8th, 1870. This paper (printed in *Friedrich's Documenta*, II. 392,) was signed among others by the Archbishops of Prague, Olmütz, Munich, Bamberg and Cologne, by the Bishops of Breslau, Mentz, Augsburg, Osnabrück, Ermland, Rottenburg, the Apostolical Vicar of Saxony, and the Prussian Field-Provost. We here read :

“ To act upon the primacy of the pope by itself, (not in connection with the general divisions of the *Schema* referring to the *Church*), is contrary to logical order. In the second public session we have sworn, that that sense of the Holy Scriptures is to be regarded as the true one, which has been always and is still understood as such by the *Church*; and in the third session we have prescribed the same truth as the rule of faith to all believers, that it belongs to the *Church* to judge concerning the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. This is the infallibility of the *Church* of Christ. But since the *Church* and the pope are not identical, and infallibility is claimed for both, the infallibility of the pope evidently cannot be acted upon, if the doctrine concerning the highest teaching office of the *Church*, and concerning the relation of the teaching office of the pope to the infallible teaching office of the *Church* of Christ has not been previously settled. This is demanded by our oath and by the norm of faith proclaimed by us; if we do not do this, we will be justly accused of having violated the laws of logic, and of having contradicted ourselves.

“ Every discussion, moreover, must start with that which is certain and beyond a doubt, and controverted by no one. But the infallibility of the *Church* of Christ is a matter of certainty, and in the minds of all Catholics beyond all doubt, which can by no means be asserted of the personal infallibility of the pope. Hence we must first act upon the *Church* and her infallible teaching office, and afterwards on the power to teach which belongs to the pope in the *Church* of God. Separate action

on the doctrine of the primacy is incompatible with the welfare of the Church, which, above all, we must keep in view. . . . It is very much to be feared, that a decree concerning the prerogatives of the pope, proclaimed apart from the doctrine concerning the Church of Christ, might fill men's minds with new prejudices, and be calculated rather to repel than to conciliate.

"The order of proceeding proposed to us is in our view incompatible also with the dignity and welfare of the holy see. Love and veneration of the pope, the successor of St. Peter, constrains us to object with all our power against such a proceeding. We know very well, indeed, that this confession of our most unfeigned devotion to the holy see, will, perhaps, on account of *the agitations which just now have blinded the minds of so many in Rome and in the Church*, be aspersed with suspicion; and we must therefore rest content with the witness which our conscience gives us, that nothing else than an honest zeal for the honor and welfare of the holy see constrains us to think to speak and to act as we do. We shall, therefore, with the, openness which belongs to true and unfeigned love, state the reasons of our conviction.

"When at first, in a paper published at Rome, the declaration of papal infallibility was demanded, all the enemies of the Church cried out,—and this godless cry spread more and more over the whole world;—that the pope, in assembling the bishops at Rome, had used the common weal merely as a pretext; *that his real design was the increase of his own power*; that the reasons urged in the Bull of June 29th, 1868, for calling the council together . . . were only pretended ones. We have . . . not ceased to protest against these calumnies. But if *after all that which has occurred in the meantime*, if after *so many epistles and public speeches, in which the holy father has himself recommended the definition of the papal infallibility*, nothing else is accomplished by the bishops convened in Council than a short doctrinal decree, viz: the four chapters concerning the Christian faith, which were published in the third session, and a decree still shorter and *even less demanded by the circumstances of the times in which we live*, the decree concerning the primacy

and the infallibility of the pope ; and if these two decrees *should be the only result of our deliberations extending over six or seven months, after reaching which we were to return home*, to renew the stubborn contest against the spirit of falsehood in those places to which God has sent us to guide His Church, uncertain whether or not the council would at a later date be continued and the whole doctrine of the Church be defined in the following year ; then indeed the calumnies referred to would acquire such force, and *by all that has happened at Rome such corroboration*, that we cannot without the deepest pain think of the decree to which *love and veneration for the holy see, and even faith itself and the salvation of souls may be shaken*. We content ourselves here with merely expressing this conviction, without adding any request ; for we can no longer reconcile it with *our episcopal dignity*, with the office which we bear in the Council, and with *the rights which are due unto us as members of the Council*, to prefer requests ; since *experience has sufficiently, and more than sufficiently taught us, that such requests are not only not entertained, but not even honored with an answer*. Nothing, therefore, remains to us, but to *cry out and protest against the proceedings referred to*, which in our view are *in the highest degree pernicious to the Church and the holy apostolic see* ; that we may thus before men and the fearful judgment of God free ourselves of responsibility for *the unhappy results which will undoubtedly shortly take place, and are even now already taking place*. *Of this the present writing is intended to be an everlasting testimony*.

“If the intended decree concerning the Church, *excluding all questions which might stir up controversies*, should be framed especially to portray before the eyes of all the beauty and majesty of the bride of Christ, to the greater honor of God and the salvation of souls, how easy it would then be for us in a short time to finish the whole doctrine of the Church, and perhaps even to celebrate together the approaching Pentecost, on which yearly the memory of the founding of the Church is renewed, with general and exceeding joy ! Then a glorious Pentecost would dawn upon the Vatican Synod, the brightness of

which would enlighten the whole earth and fill all Christians with joy. But, alas, this joy is scarcely to be hoped for; on the contrary we have reason to fear, that this Pentecost will be for us *a day of sorrow, rather than a day of joy*. This they will have to answer for, who, neglecting to provide through the Council for the urgent needs of Christendom, vanquish not the enemies of the Church but their own brethren and gain the palm of victory for mere scholastic opinions, which will inflict a severe injury upon the Church; an occasion now, and still much more in prospect of the future, for abiding concern and fear.

“ May it please God to ward off such calamity from the Vatican Council, and by His heavenly grace to restore us all to harmony.”

VII.

Individually, also, did the German bishops express themselves concerning papal infallibility, in the written remarks on the prescribed *schema* (plan), which they handed in to the special commission of the Council. The report of the commission on these remarks is printed in *Friedrich's Documenta* II. 202, etc. We select from it (No. 7-13) the following extracts.

Archbishop Melchers of Cologne, remarks :

“ As regards the definition concerning the infallibility of the pope, I am certainly altogether *inclined* to believe, that God will not suffer His representative on earth, who is invested with the highest office and the highest power to teach and to guide the Church, to depart from the way of truth, as often as in the practice of his office he instructs the whole Church in matters of faith and morals. I will also very cheerfully accept and admit, that to such decrees and decisions of the pope all believers owe a true and sincere obedience. But to the proposed definition concerning the infallibility of the pope I *cannot* for various reasons, give my assent.

“ In the first place I am not convinced that the same is *necessary*. For the authority of the holy apostolical see in reference to teaching and deciding in matters of faith and morals was never greater than just now. *But to establish without necessity new doctrinal definitions, has never down to this*

time been customary in the Catholic Church, and is also not advisable.

“ Moreover, the infallibility of the pope is still a matter of controversy among theologians, and *many learned and orthodox men regard this definition as an impossibility*; on the one side because of the many weighty objections which can be urged against it on the ground of various historical facts and of manifold utterances of the holy fathers, which prove that *a unanimous and general assent with reference to this point never existed in the Church*; on the other side, on account of the difficulty of so framing the definition, that room would not be left for very many doubts and controversies concerning the interpretation and application of the same to particular cases both in the past and in the future.

“ Many, again, even of those who are inclined to give their assent to the view of the infallibility of the pope, *do not possess such a sure and firm conviction*, as is needed, in order, without heavy guilt, to prescribe and impose this view upon the faith of believers on penalty of everlasting damnation. It is therefore *not at all to be expected*, that this definition can be adopted with *unanimity*, and it is not to be doubted that a large number of bishops will oppose the definition. *Down to this time, however, it has never been customary in the Church of God, nor held to be right, to accept new doctrinal definitions without at least the moral unanimous assent of all the bishops present at the Council.* Therefore I urgently beg that the discussion of this matter may be held in total abeyance during this Council, that by means of this discussion the greatest diversity of opinion among the fathers may not become manifest, and the authority of the Vatican be thus seriously impaired.

“ I further hold a definition concerning the infallibility of the pope at the present time to be highly inopportune for the following reasons:

“ To many believers, especially in countries of mixed confessions both in the East and the West, in which this view has not heretofore been acknowledged, aye, not even known, such a doctrinal definition would furnish occasion for the strongest

temptation to schism and apostacy from the faith, since they would discover therein a change of religion, in fact a change in the very foundation of it.

“ 2. Many believers in Christ, who yet stand separate from the Church but desire to return to it, would by this become so perplexed, and so estranged from the Church, that they would be further off from her than ever before.

“ 3. In the minds of many believers this definition would not increase the love and devotion to the holy see, by which they are now animated, but it would rather diminish and weaken them.

“ These are the reasons why I pray and desire, that the discussion and definition of the infallibility of the pope may be held utterly in abeyance. Or, if this is not regarded with favor let a number of men of high erudition be chosen from both the friends and opponents of this definition, charged with the dnty of minutely and thoroughly investigating and clearing up on both sides the question under discussion, and of gathering all arguments and documents having reference to it, that so the truth may become evident to all; and then let this same question be brought forward a newat the next Council, or at a later date at the present one, if it should continue so long.

“ But since some very recent unjust and intemperate attacks of certain professors and newspapers upon the authority of the holy see seem to require some check and counteraction, I could wish that a supplement or canon might be added to chapter II. setting forth: That the pope possesses the highest authority to teach and judge in matters of faith and morals, and that all believers owe a true and unfeigned obedience to his decrees and judgments.”

VIII.

Bishop Kremenz of Ermland, declares:

“ 1. The definition contained in the *schema* seems in no wise to be necessary; for the rights of the apostolical see are not in our day called in question by Catholics; on the contrary there has never perhaps been a time, when the children of the Church have so cheerfully obeyed the pope as at present.

“2. There are not wanting men who are strongly attached to the Catholic Church, who from doctrinal and historical grounds regard such a definition as impossible. In fact very weighty difficulties are still in the way. Who does not know, to refer merely to what is universally known, that the controversy concerning the Honorius question is by no means at present in such a posture that the doctrine in question can be proclaimed as revealed of God?

“3. It is not clear how, if infallibility is attributed to the pope alone, the rights of the general councils and of the bishops can remain untouched.

“4. Concerning the truth, the manner, the meaning and the compass of this definition, not only the theologians, but even the fathers of the Vatican Council themselves are at variance; so that it can scarcely be otherwise, but that instead of the numerical, or at least, moral unanimity, which, according to the tradition of our predecessors and the history of the general councils, is necessary to a doctrinal definition, a broad diversity of votes would show itself. . . .

“6. The definition of papal infallibility seems to a certain extent to threaten disastrous consequences. For according to the testimony of many bishops it is certain that in various dioceses of Germany, France, Bohemia, Hungary, Transylvania and other countries this doctrine is not known even by name to the Catholic people. I must confess also that in the diocese of Ermland the doctrine in question is never presented catechetically nor from the pulpit, nor has it for a long time past been touched upon in theological lectures. It is to be feared that in the region named the minds of the catholics may become unsettled by this definition, as if at this late date the foundation of the Church and of the true doctrine were to be for the first time definitely fixed. But in other regions which are known to me, and where Catholics live mixed up with the heterodox, still greater dangers threaten the weak. . . . The bishops of various countries with whom I have conversed, nearly all agree with me in opinion, that this definition would, under present political circumstances, and especially in Europe, offer to many govern-

ments a reason or at least a pretext, of encroaching more and more upon the rights of the Church."

IX.

Cardinal Rauscher, Archbishop of Vienna, says among other things :

" I openly confess that up to this time I have not been able to overcome the difficulties which are in the way of this definition. Since we must confine ourselves to that which has been believed by all, it will be necessary to prove, that Christians have always, at least *implicite*, believed, that God has so endowed the successors of St. Peter, that that which in the discharge of their apostolical office they decree concerning faith and morals, must be free from error, and accepted by all. Hence it is not sufficient to set aside as irrelevant to the matter the objections derived from authentic historical documents; they must be refuted. If I were to use the evasions, to which not a few theologians have resorted in reference to the Honorius question, I would make myself simply ridiculous. To employ sophisms, seems to me to be unworthy of the episcopal office, and of the subject which ought to be acted upon in the fear of God; mere prudence indeed, forbids the use of such artful tricks. . .

" It would have been possible for the Lord to grant the same assistance of the Holy Ghost to the successors of St. Peter to the end of the world, which was enjoyed by Peter, Paul and John; and to reveal and ordain : As often, after I have taken my apostles up into my kingdom, as there are doubts concerning the rule of faith and practice, apply to the successor of my servant Peter; and whatever he shall tell you, that shall be for you the utterance not of a man, but of the Comforter whom I am to send you. Would not this have been, according to human judgment, the best antidote for the errors, which grow upon the field of the Lord? But it has not pleased the Lord to grant us this protection. . . .

" That in the earliest centuries it was not believed, that the pope had received from God such special authority to teach, as to make general councils superfluous is proven by the utterances

of St. Augustine and other church fathers, as well as by the utterances and the practice of the popes themselves.

“The popes have in general faithfully fulfilled the office of strengthening their brethren ; while however a few of them, as is proved by facts, failed to discharge this duty. Honorius did not strengthen his brethren. . . . In regard to the administrator of the sacrament of ordination, Stephen III., Stephen VII., Sergius III. and Leo IX. were in error.

“A very great difficulty arises from the bull *Unam Sanctam* of Boniface VIII. If in the definition of matters of faith and morals Boniface VIII. was incapable of error, then the contents of this papal decision, the doctrine of Boniface concerning the divinely ordered and established relation of the ecclesiastical authority to the civil, and the obligations arising from it, are to be believed in as a truth revealed by God. There are some in the present time, who, in order to evade this difficulty, assert, that Boniface VIII. wished to define nothing else than this ; that all men are in duty bound to acknowledge the Roman pope as the head of the Church appointed by Christ. But the supposition, upon which the representatives of this assertion must base themselves, is absurd.

In a treatise (*Observationes*, etc., Vienna, 1870), published during the continuance of the council, Cardinal Rauscher says, p. 14, “An ecumenical council is by no means a parliament, which, under the presidency of the pope, can by a majority of votes make enactments concerning the faith of Christians. For . . . it is necessary to a final decision in matters of faith, that the assent of all the churches be evident ; and, in order to prove this assent, a unanimous, or nearly unanimous resolution of the fathers is required.”

X.

Cardinal Schwarzenberg, Archbishop of Prague, said :

“The obligation of my office constrains me to give my voice as in the presence of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, for the full and entire setting aside of the decree proposed to the Council. I must express this view both with reference to the form and the contents

of the decree, and also with reference to the weighty demands of the Church and the times.

“If something is proposed and commanded to be accepted as with divine faith, then one thing must be certain; that either from the Holy Scriptures, or from the constant and divine tradition of the Church,—namely, from the testimonies of the fathers, or at least from the acts and the practice of the Church—it can be established as revealed, as having proceeded from Christ and the Holy Spirit. . . . The proposed doctrine, that the pope independently of the bishops (for not a word is said of the latter), cannot err in the definition of matters of faith and morals, *does not possess these requirements, which are necessary to the definition of a doctrine; for it is not so evidently contained in the Holy Scriptures or in the divine tradition of the Church, as is beyond all doubt required for a doctrinal definition.*

“On the contrary, not a few utterances and acts of popes and general councils can be cited, which prove that the pope, whenever without the co-operation of the bishops he expresses himself publicly in matters of faith, is liable to err. The councils have subjected doctrinal writings of popes to their own judgment, and either approved and accepted them, or, of which there is a sad instance, condemned them. Just as on the one side the fathers of Chalcedon received with the greatest applause the celebrated epistle of Leo the Great to Flavianus, and greeted it as the doctrine of St. Peter, so on the other hand did the sixth general council condemn the doctrinal epistle of pope Honorius to Sergius. . . . But if the Church judges infallibly concerning heretical writings, if an oecumenical council with the consent of the pope himself has condemned the public doctrine of a pope as heretical, how can the Vatican Council proclaim the infallibility of the pope when teaching publicly, without at the same time destroying faith in the infallibility of the Church?

“The canon law teaches throughout that a heretical pope can be deposed; aye, that on account of heresy he at once loses the papal dignity. This can be understood only of an ex-

ternal heresy (for a judge does not judge concerning internals); and the doctors of law do not understand this of a pope who secretly, but one of who openly teaches heresy, or contumaciously and publicly contradicts the true doctrine; hence not of the private person of the pope, but of the pope as such.

"The proposed decree therefore does not by any means contain a catholic doctrine, such as has been believed always, everywhere, and by all."

"It is in conflict with Christian love and wisdom, by increasing rocks of offense, to impose a greater burden upon believers than they are able to bear, and to provoke and embitter the enemies of the Church. However good the intention of the authors of the *schema* may have been, those who, without the simplicity of the dove which guards the faith of the forefathers against innovation, and without the wisdom of the serpent, which defends from danger and injury, have introduced this doctrine into the council, would, if we should adopt this definition, be responsible to the eternal Judge for the sad consequences, which it is not difficult to foresee."

In a work * written by Prof. *S. Mayer*, at the instance of Cardinal *Schwarzenberg*, and distributed by the latter among the members of the Council, we read p. 19: "If any doctrine, as is clearly the case with the present one, is not so spoken of, *either in the Holy Scriptures or in tradition*, as to make it evident that it was always, everywhere and by all received; if, on the other hand, there are irrefutable arguments to prove the *opposite*, then assuredly such a doctrine cannot become the subject of a doctrinal definition." The work concludes as follows: "He that exalteth himself shall be humbled, is the judgment of a righteous God. After Boniface VIII. had by a solemn definition elevated the authority of the pope over secular kingdoms to the highest pinnacle, there followed a long and ignominious outward humiliation of the holy see. May we not fear if the papal power of the same see is elevated above due measure, that according to the inscrutable counsel of God a spiritual

* *De summi pontificis infallsibilitate*, Naples, 1870.

humiliation may follow in the wide-spread estrangement of many from the holy see? And now, ye kings, be wise!"

XI.

Fürstenbeg, Archbishop of Olmütz, says:

"To give my views openly, I will say that I vote unhesitatingly that the Council issue no decree whatever on this subject, and impose no new yoke of faith.

"In the first place, I have thus far been unable to convince myself, that the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope rests upon such proofs of universality, antiquity and unanimous assent, as to justify us to designate it with absolute certainty a true and special deposit of the catholic faith. For, as Vincentius Lerinensis says, in the Catholic Church we must carefully aim to retain that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all. In consideration of this reliable rule of faith, the fathers assembled at the council of Trent, after they had carefully weighed the question concerning the infallibility of the pope, resolved with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, to issue no doctrinal definition, no decree, concerning this point. How much weight is to be attached to the unanimous assent of the fathers assembled in council, was shown by pope Pius IV., who directed his legate presiding over that council, that nothing was to be resolved upon concerning the authority of the pope, unless it had the unanimous assent of the fathers.

"Secondly. Being present at this Synod, to give in virtue of my episcopal office before God and the fathers of the Synod a true and righteous testimony of the faith, *I cannot testify with a good conscience*, that the doctrine presented in the supplement concerning the infallibility of the pope is a subject of general prevailing faith in my very extensive archdiocese, so that the clergy and people committed to my care are unanimous in this article. On the contrary, I am deeply impressed with the sad consequences, which a doctrinal definition of this point would involve for the Catholic cause in Moravia, and I foresee with trembling that very many believers would not only take the gravest offence at the introduction

of the new doctrine, but would also be exposed to the most imminent danger of suffering shipwreck in their faith."

XII.

Bishop *Hefele*, of *Rottenburg*, says:

"I heartily assent to all what has been said by another father (Cardinal *Rauscher*) against the opportuneness of this declaration, and concerning the great dangers and disadvantages which would accrue therefrom to the Church, as also concerning the necessity of a unanimous, or, at least, morally unanimous assent of the fathers in reference to doctrinal definitions. I feel myself bound in conscience, however, to add a few things besides. Even if the question of opportuneness should be regarded as of no account, and if also no dangers and prejudices to the Church were to be feared,—but, alas, very great dangers and prejudices *are* to be feared, and they must be gravely considered—the definition of the infallibility of the pope ought nevertheless still to be declined.

"In short, the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope seems to me *to be founded neither in the Holy Scriptures, nor in the tradition of the Church*. Nay, if I do not deceive myself, *the opposite doctrine was held by Christian antiquity*, and not a few objections to the declaration of the new doctrine arise from church history and the expressions of the holy fathers.

"Whenever in the ancient Church controversies and doubts arose concerning a point of faith, then the controversy was settled by bringing forward and comparing the consentaneous utterances of the ancient fathers, as we are told by *Vincentius Lerinensis*. It was especially examined what had always been believed concerning the disputed point in the apostolical churches at Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, etc. ; and according to the result of this investigation, that which had everywhere, always and by all been believed, was by a doctrinal decision and declaration proposed to the acceptance of believers. *No one of the ancients ever dreamed* that an infallible decision of any disputed point whatever was to be reached, as it were, by a shorter way through the individual declaration of any person

whoever he may have been; on the contrary, *Vincentius Lerinensis* says: 'Let us always cleave unto universality, antiquity, unanimity.'

XIII.

Bishop Iirsik, of Budweis, says:

"I am by no means convinced that the doctrine of the personal infallibility of the pope, as it is proposed in the *schema*, can, by clear and unequivocal testimonies of the Holy Scriptures, or by a divine and unbroken tradition of the Church, or by reliable acts and the practice of the Church, be so clearly shown to have been revealed of God, as to allow it with proper certainty, to be doctrinally defined; and to make it possible to show that this article of faith has been always, everywhere, and by all believed, and that therefore it is truly and eminently catholic, and an essential part of the divine deposit. I hold such definition, moreover, to be utterly inopportune and dangerous. . . Foreseeing the ruin of souls which threatens, I will rather die than give my consent to what the decree proposes."

XIV.

Bishop Ketteler, of Mentz, distributed among the members of the Council a work (*Quæstio*, printed in *Friedrich's Documenta*, I. 1, etc.), written by an anonymous theologian, in which, among others, the following passages occur:

"Would it not be a new spectacle, and one worthy in the highest degree of the amazement of all centuries, that a general and œcumenical Synod should be called together for the purpose of declaring: That itself and all preceding œcumenical Synods had possessed no original power independent of the sole judgment of the pope; that a general council was merely an outward pageant, a grand solemnity, to invest with greater *pomp* decisions in matters of faith made by the pope as the only witness, the only judge, and the only lawgiver?" (p. 104.)

"It has always been believed that the pope possesses the primacy, and, with the *Church*, the power of teaching infallibly; but this personal and independent infallibility of the pope has been both in name and substance unknown to the *Church*,

and has only in these last times *been invented* by certain pious men." (p. 109.)

"It would ill accord with divine wisdom to establish such an infallible teaching office, since it would be the prerogative merely of a single individual, would infringe upon the liberty and authority of all other judges appointed by divine wisdom, and could be maintained only by a continuous miracle. It cannot easily be believed that Christ instituted this personal infallibility, the definition of which can on the one side secure no advantage, while it is calculated on the other side to stir up widespread confusion, to expose the Church to violent storms, and to prove for weak and wavering Catholics a cause of the greatest harm, as it must raise up also between us and all schismatic churches, between us and all Protestants and non-catholics, an everlasting wall of separation." (p. 121.)

"This definition would be something unheard of, and would stand in contradiction with the practice which the Church has always followed in her definitions; since as regards this point so many theologians, so many learned men, so many schools in the past, and still more in the present, have entertained opposite views; since a large part of the Church, a large part of the clergy and the bishops sets itself against this definition, and loudly declares that no decision can be made by the council concerning the point in question without violating to the greatest degree the fundamental rules of an oecumenical Council. This definition, which originated amid such evil auspices, and is carried forward under still worse, threatens to produce a schism within the Church, and a violent and irreconcilable aversion of noncatholics towards us. The supreme power of the pope has never been so illustriously, so obediently and enthusiastically acknowledged by the clergy and the bishops, as in our own times. If that enthusiasm seems for the moment to be declining, it is just this unhappy question that is the cause of it, and if it has borne such evil fruits already in its incipiency, every sober-minded man may not only conjecture, but clearly foresee what it will produce if carried through." (p. 127.)

XV.

The vote on the decree of infallibility, which took place July 13, 1870, resulted as follows: *Placet* (yea) 370; *Non Placet* (nay) 88; *Placet juxta modum* (conditional yea) 62; about seventy votes were absent. Of the German bishops the following voted *Non Placet*: the Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Rauscher; the archbishops of Olmütz, Munich, and Bamberg; the bishops of Mentz, Trieste, Breslau, Augsburg, Budweis, Treves, Osnabrück, Ermland, Rottenburg, Lavant, the apostolical vicar of Saxony, and the Prussian field-provost; the archbishops of Salzburg and Cologne voted *Placet juxta modum*.

Notwithstanding that this vote did not result in such a unanimity as is indispensable to a doctrinal definition, the definition nevertheless took place on the 18th of July. On the day before, July 17, the following paper was addressed by fifty bishops to the pope:

“Most Holy Father! In the General Congregation of the 13th of the present month, we cast our votes on the *schema* of the first doctrinal constitution concerning the Church of Christ.

“It is known to your holiness that 88 fathers, constrained by their conscience and their love to the holy Church, absolved their vote with *Non Placet*, that 62 others voted *Placet juxta Modum*, and that finally about 70 were absent from the congregation, and thus abstained from voting. To these must be added others, who partly on account of sickness, and partly for other sufficient reasons, had returned to their dioceses.

“In this manner our votes became publicly known to your holiness, and to the whole world, and it became evident how many bishops approved of our views; thus also we became aware of the office and duty which devolves upon us.

“Since that time, however, nothing at all has happened which could change our conviction; on the contrary, many and very weighty things have occurred, which do not permit us to desist from our resolution. We therefore declare, that we renew and confirm the votes which we have already given.

“ Whilst by this act then we confirm our votes, we also at the same time express our resolution to absent ourselves from the public session which is to be held on the 18th of this month. For that filial piety and reverence which lately brought our legates to the feet of your holiness, does not permit us, in a matter which so clearly appertains to the person of your holiness, to say publicly, and in the very face of our father, *Non Placet*.

“ We could, besides, in the solemn session only reiterate the votes already given in the General Congregation.

“ We return, therefore, without delay to our folds, where after so long an absence our presence, on account of rumors of war and their own most important spiritual needs, is required in the highest degree, lamenting as we do that in the present sad condition of things we shall find the peace and quiet of consciences also disturbed.

“ Meanwhile we commend the Church of God and your holiness, to whom we vow unchanged fidelity and obedience, with all our hearts, to the grace and protection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are, with others who agree with us, though not present, your holiness’ most obedient sons.”

Of the German bishops the following signed this paper: Cardinal Schwarzenberg, the archbishops of Munich and Olmütz, the bishops of Augsburg, Treves, Rottenberg, and Ermeland, the apostolic vicar of Saxony, and the Prussian field-provost.

XVI.

Cardinal Rauscher wrote, Dec. 2, 1870, to a number of German theologians (*vid. J. Langen, Das Vaticanische Dogma*, I, 108):

“ On the 11th of March a conference was asked for, to consist of several members of the *Deputatio de fide* and a number of those bishops who were of opinion that a profounder investigation was indispensable. At the same time it was shown that a thorough discussion of the question at stake, being so extensively ramified, so difficult and delicate, was not possible in the

General Congregation. The conference, however, was declined. I seized the opportunity offered by the general debate, to point out the necessity of a discussion which should be thorough and embrace all difficulties; my effort, however, was in vain."

XVII.

Abbot Haneberg, lately appointed bishop of Speyer, wrote, August 22, 1870, to Hefele, bishop of Rottenburg:

"The longer I occupy myself with the question, the more closely I compare the reasons for and against infallibility, the more clearly I believe I can see that the ancient Church, that is, the Church of the first eight centuries, knew nothing of this doctrine. Towards the close of this period I meet with this expression of St. Boniface, whose name is borne by our house and our Church: 'The pope, who is himself authorized to judge all, can be judged by no one, except it be that he is found as having departed from the faith.' This utterance is in harmony with canon 11 of the eighth ecumenical council, of 869, and with the fourth and fifth sessions of the council of Constance, which was approved of by at least three popes. In view of these, and perhaps even still stronger reasons, the majority of the bishops of Germany and Austria opposed the definition of infallibility. I have discovered no reason to deviate from our bishops. I had hoped that Rome, taking in view the number of these bishops, and the great number of believers whom they represent, would desist. It did otherwise. Since the 18th of July the doctrine of infallibility stands proclaimed as a dogma of the Church.

"Were all those bishops and theologians who in substance entertained Bossuet's idea of the primacy, and its prerogatives, in error? Is it possible to regard something as untrue on to the 18th of July, 1870, and from that time forward as true? What is to be done?

"Theoretically there are for us who wish to live and die as Catholics only two ways: the one leads to doubt and denial of the validity of the Council, the other to submission. What motives in either direction are offered by the order of the business

and the conduct of the Council, is best known to your episcopal grace. That the bishops were not told openly from the beginning: 'The thing aimed at is the extirpation of the theory set up by Bossuet;' that they were not told: 'The object is to elevate the primacy as regards its power both to govern and teach,' is a grave objection.' A still graver one is the want of unanimity, regarding, as it does, a long tolerated scholastic question. When at Chalcedon a majority carried its cause over a minority, the matter at stake was the rejection of a doctrine which had never been tolerated in the Church; here, however, the matter at stake is the rejection of a doctrine* which for a long time has been taught in many schools, and according to our conviction has in its favor the vote of the ancient Church, and of the eighth and sixteenth (of Constance) councils."

Who, looking at the matter theoretically, will deny that the genuineness and validity of the last Vatican resolution may not be controverted?

ART. V.—THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.†

BY PRESIDENT J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, D.D.

No one can foresee as yet, with any certainty, what is to be the course and end of the new struggle for reformation, which has been called forth in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church by the late Vatican decree of Papal Infallibility. But of the immense significance of the movement there can be no question. Even if it should prove a present failure, the idea embodied in it cannot be destroyed, and this is of such a nature that no such outward want of success can make it void or vain.

* Viz: that of Bossuet.

† 1. *Verhandlungen des zweiten Altkatholiken Congresses zu Köln. Officielle Ausgabe Köln und Leipzig, 1872.*

2. *Deutscher Merkur, Organ für die katholische Reformbewegung in Auftrage der Comites zu Köln und München, herausgegeben von Franz Hirschwälde, Weltpriester.*

If not in one way, still most surely then in some other way, it will accomplish God's holy pleasure, and "prosper in the thing whereunto it is sent;" and this end will be found entering profoundly into the most solemn religious and political issues of the age. In this view the movement, without regard to any outward observation to which it has yet come, is of true world-historical importance. Looking at it in all its relations and bearings, retrospective and prospective, it may be doubted if any demonstration in the past history of the Christian world deserves to be considered of greater account. It has its field of action and display thus far mainly in Germany; but it is not for this reason only of German concern. All that concerns German thought and German life, has been since the age of the Reformation, but is now more than ever of concern for the universal life of the world. Not to know this is of itself to be deficient in the proper culture of the age in which we live. — The Old Catholic movement thus is all the more worthy of attention, just because it is a German movement thus far, stirring the German nationality to its inmost depths. In Italy, in France, in England, or even in our own United States, it would not mean half so much. As it is, the movement is for the world at large, and has in it a sense which pertains to the ages. It challenges accordingly the most serious regard of the thoughtful among all civilized nations. In this view it is that so much space is given to the subject in the present number of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW; and if what we now say be true, no other apology can be needed for bestowing upon it so large an amount of notice and attention.

The better part of the Roman Catholic world, it is well known, was filled with uneasy apprehension and fear, before the coming together of the Vatican Council in Rome, in the month of December, 1869. The reasons for calling the Council were not made public. They were not found in the general consciousness and will of the Roman Catholic Church. They lay as a portentous mystery, more or less, in the breast of Pius the Ninth, and in the dark policy of his Jesuit counsellors. But enough was known, through the famous *Syllabus*, through the

Pope's organ, called the "*Civilita*," and in other ways, to make it felt widely in Europe, that the occasion was fraught with the most critical interest for the Catholic Church, and for the general peace of the world; that the coming council was to be used as an agency only to ratify and establish the foregone ultramontane conclusion of the Pope's infallibility; and that along with this then, war was to be declared at the same time, in the full spirit of medieval obscurantism, with the entire culture and civilization of the world's modern life in every other view. All through the summer of 1869, the fear of what might come to pass in this way, the feeling of an uncertain and not well defined danger in the near future, lay like the ominous sweltering sense of an approaching thunder-storm, on the soul of Catholic Christendom outside of the Italian Peninsula*—largely in France, but most of all in Germany and Austria. The Pastoral Letter put forth by the German Bishops in joint assembly at Fulda, quoted in the preceding article of this REVIEW, *The*

* We find this foreboding of evil strongly expressed by the illustrious convert, J. H. Newman, in England. In one of his letters, he deplores the sad condition into which the Church was brought by an aggressive and presumptuous party; which, he says, had so managed things, that the prospect of a general Council, instead of awaking joy in the minds of good Catholics, had become for them a source only of anxiety and alarm, under the apprehension that the Council was not about to avert a great danger from the Church, but rather to bring upon it new difficulty of the most serious kind. "He is himself troubled, to think of having to defend and explain to others decisions, which, however he might be able to get along with them for himself, it would be still very hard to maintain in the face of historical facts. In other cases, the Church had defined articles of faith only when forced to it by stern and even painful necessity. Even among the best friends of the Church some are ready to give up theology altogether as a bad job, whilst others doubt the capacity of these Bishops called together from all corners of the earth to know what may be suitable for European society, or are displeased with the Holy See for lending its ear to the flatteries of a clique of Jesuits, Redemptorists and Converts. He professes himself to be all the while at a loss what to do; but in the meantime was invoking all the great teachers of the Ancient Church, St. Augustine and others, that through their intercessions the vast impending calamity might be averted. If it were actually God's will, however, that the Papal Infallibility should be decreed, then must it be His will also that the time of victory for His Church be indefinitely postponed, and so there would be nothing left for him (Dr. J. H. Newman) but to bow his head beneath this inscrutable providence." Thus characteristically the great Oratorian, the most thoroughly learned man in Catholic England. All in full antagonism of course to the much lesser light, his once devoted disciple, Archbishop Manning.

German Bishops as Witnesses of the Truth, is a striking testimony to the prevalence of such solicitous apprehension and concern. It was intended to operate as a breakwater to the threatening evil, and is an assurance (resented as offensive at Rome) that the Bishops of German tongue, at least, might be relied upon as pillars of the truth against all Vatican innovations. They pledge themselves solemnly to the German nation, to stand firmly in the coming Council to the three following principles. First: "That the Council should bring in no new doctrine, and no other teaching than what was already inscribed by their faith and conscience on the part of all German Catholics." Secondly: "That no general council may or can ever give the character of doctrine to what is not contained in sacred Scripture or Apostolic tradition." Thirdly: "That only the old and original Christian truth could in any case be proclaimed by the Council, if needful, in clearer light and form." That the Pope's infallibility, and the medieval monstrosity of the *Syllabus*, were articles of belief which did *not* for these good German Bishops, fall within the range and limit of these conservative principles, is abundantly plain from their other declarations given in the articles going before, as well as from the stand which they actually made against the Vatican assumptions in the Vatican Council itself. In a very sorrowful and humiliating way, they made some show of a good fight for the old faith of their own consciences, which with some of them at least was kept up to the end. What followed in the end the world no longer needs to be told. One after another they have committed upon themselves a sort of ecclesiastical *hari-kari*, and have thus done what they could to impart to the Vatican decree a character of *ex-post-facto* œcumenicity, which all the world knows never belonged to it in fact.

Any one looking into the constitution of the Council, and noting the history of its proceedings, may easily see how entirely it lacked the conditions and qualifications that are needed, in the judgment of the Catholic world itself as well as in the light of the simplest common sense, to furnish a valid representation of the mind and will of the Church in any such universal form. The

Vatican Council was neither universal, nor free, nor harmonious. There was no room in it for general discussion or common understanding. There was with it no taking whatever of the real sense and mind of the Church, whether of past ages or of the present time, with regard to the points on which it was called to pronounce judgment. Instead of this, it presents to us from first to last a barefaced endeavor to preclude inquiry, to prevent consultation, to gag free utterance both of speech and press; for all which we have substituted the miserable chicanery, trickery and wire-working of the Italian spirit in its worst form, laboring through long weeks and months of wearisome inanity to secure by diplomatic management, what there was no possibility of reaching in the way of simplicity and godly sincerity; namely, that *moral unanimity* so much talked of, without which Romanists themselves tell us no simple numerical majority can ever be sufficient to establish any article of faith. There was no such unanimity in the Vatican Council. All the unanimity that can be attributed to it (and even this as we have seen dates in part only from a later time) comes of the Pope's outward dictation enforced by his army of Italian priests. As indeed why should it be otherwise, if the Pope be infallible? Had not the council of bishops been convened to make this a dogma of the Church by ecumenical decree? And must not their decree for such purpose be itself infallible? But how could it be that, except as the Council might be in truth the mouthpiece simply of the Pope himself, the only fountain of all such infallibility among men? It is only in keeping with the new order of things, therefore, that the decree of his own autocracy and self-sufficiency was by Pio Nono submitted to the council, and engineered through the council, all in his own name, with a simple *sacro approbante concilio* tacked to it in the loosest sort of form, not for *his* credit apparently (that needed no such consenting vote), but for the credit wholly of the venerable body of episcopal subordinates and proxies, who had come together from the ends of the earth to do implicit homage to their magnificent chief in this most passively obedient way.

Mere superiority of numbers it was, from the beginning, that gave the Council the character of a machine in the hands of the Pope and his satellites, to grind into powder finally the moral superiority which lay wholly on the opposite side. Only look at the following: "The representation of the several nations and church sections in the Council may furnish instructive reflection. Frenchmen and Germans have to exercise themselves here in the virtues of humility and modesty, and to learn how little they signify in the Catholic Church, when it comes to doctrine and legislation. There is the diocese of Breslau with 1,700,000 Catholics; its Bishop has not been chosen here into a single commission; whereas the 700,000 inhabitants of the existing Church-State, are represented by 62 bishops, and in all commissions the Italians form from the half to two-thirds. For the kingdom of God, in which the least is greater than John the Baptist and all the prophets, lies confessedly between Montefiascone and Terracina, and whosoever has seen the light of the world in Sonnino or Belletti, in Ceccano, Anagni or Rieti, he has been even in the cradle predestinated *imperio regere populos*. True it has not yet succeeded with the 62 bishops of this elect land and people to establish even the most modest measure of morality in their towns and villages; whole regions and districts remain still in notorious fellowship with brigands; but about such things the council need not trouble itself. There are the arch-dioceses of Cologne with 1,400,000 Catholics, of Cambray with 1,300,000, of Paris with two million; but of the 68 Neapolitan and Sicilian bishops in the Council four alone are sufficient to nullify these prelates together with the five million Germans and French standing behind them. So the twelve million Catholics of Germany proper are represented in this Council by fourteen voices. To express the relation one might say: In church matters twenty Germans are not worth quite so much as one Italian. And should any German take it into his head, that his nation, with its numerous theological seminaries and its learned theologians, ought rightly to have some weight with the Council, he need only come here to be effectually cured of that fancy. In all Italy, with the exception of Rome, there is not a

single real theological faculty. Spain also gets along without higher theological schools, and without theology, but here in this council, nevertheless, some hundreds of Italians and Spaniards are lords, and born teachers, and dictators of faith for all the nations that belong to the Church!" *Quirinus*, Letter IX.

For a brief enumeration of some of the damaging and disenabling conditions under which the council was held, the reader is referred to what is said with regard to the subject on pages 135 and 136 of the last number of the MERCERSBURG REVIEW, in the strong article *Conscience and the Vatican*, translated from Professor Reinkens. To this we add here another fuller and still more telling picture, which was brought out during the Council itself in a French paper, the *Moniteur Universel*, by a vigorous pen in Rome, attributed to one of the French Bishops, and which created at the time, we are told, quite a sensation in French circles. It is quoted here from the *Römische Briefe vom Concil* by Quirinus, Letter XXIV.

"The Council of Trent," says this French writer, "determined for itself its own order of business; for the present Council all has been different; all was prescribed beforehand, and imposed upon the fathers, by the Pope; even the secretaries and scrutators were named in advance. No initiative was allowed to the bishops; the commission of overtures was formed from the most zealous infallibilists and from members of the curia; the final decision, however, being reserved for the Pope. Those presenting overtures were not suffered to explain or defend them, so that the freedom of the bishops to make propositions was rendered altogether illusory. By the formation of the four commissions chosen from Roman lists all decisive labors are thrown into the hands of the few infallibilists whom the curia has selected for this purpose; while 700 bishops are excluded from all part in such business; among them all the Germans who signed the address from Fulda to the Pope, and the most distinguished French prelates. In general, all the bishops that were not known as decided infallibilists, have been systematically excluded from the commissions. It was quite

otherwise at Trent, where all the fathers, divided into four congregations, could take real part in the proceedings. To this is added now the monstrous disproportion of national representation; the altogether enormous and all-absorbing preponderance of the Italians, still farther strengthened by the whole troop of apostolic vicars, which, without any legal form, can be turned out from the Propaganda at any time. So it is that the Italian bishops alone are more numerous, than all the French, German, Hungarian and North American taken together, although these represent an almost three times larger population. Through the weakness of the two French Cardinals who should have taken the lead, *Bonnechose* and *Mathieu*, the attempt to unite the French bishops in a national group failed. *Bonnechose* consulting Antonelli on the subject got for answer: Only in groups of fifteen, or at short twenty bishops, may the French meet together. The evil of this was soon apparent. The bishops have been forced by the will of the Pope to hold their sessions in a hall, where a third part of them at least could not understand a word that was spoken; so that for example, Cardinal di Pietro after a long time declared, he had not yet actually comprehended a single address; while another Cardinal affirmed, that of all the addresses not forty words had reached him. A truly thorough investigation, a living exchange of thought and counter-thought, is here out of the question. No speaker may hope to produce an effect on such an audience. Thus it happened that the first *schema*, a document of 150 pages, was spoken upon for many weeks in a general way, without its coming to a special discussion of any of the single articles, and in spite of the numerous speakers also without the bringing of any one point to a clear conclusion. The only effect was, great loss of time, much bodily weariness, and deep discouragement. If the object had been to sicken the assembly of all addresses even to loathing, it could not have been contrived better. If only the fathers might have read the discourses which they could not hear, but, alas, neither must they be read; not even at their own cost may the bishops have their overtures and speeches printed. Many in this way, from the certainty

of not being heard, have lost the power of expressing their views altogether. Vast preparations were made in the two years before the opening of the Council, amounting to stuff for ten councils; but it is only brought out for the bishops in fragments, so that there is wanting with them all insight into the consideration and meaning of single determinations. Seven hundred bishops in this way have had set before them a previously fabricated council, which like a woven pattern they are now forced to unravel again. In this work, having no means allowed them for preliminary common understanding, the body has become in large part deaf-dumb; and has got itself fairly jammed into a narrow pass, from which it can never extricate itself without an entire change in its order of business. No man is able to say how it is to be with the discussion of the single articles of the several *schemata*, and yet the Council, in issuing decrees that are to bind the world under pain of an accompanying anathema, is bound surely to weigh every word in the most careful way."

So much from this French witness. It is a graphic sketch, showing clearly the spiritual impotency of the Vatican Council for the work it was called to do, so far as all the laws of ordinary human intelligence and conscience are concerned. What shall we say then? Must we believe that these ordinary conditions of right human judgment were not needed in this case, and that their absence only served to make room the more fully for the presence of the Divine Spirit with which the Bishop of Rome claims to have been endowed for the occasion? That seems to be virtually what we are required to believe by the modern ultramontane would be task-masters of our faith. The authority of the Vatican Council had in this view nothing to do with the capacity of the body for its work: the all-sufficiency of the Pope makes that all right.

And more yet; this all-sufficiency of the Pope has nothing to do with the personal capabilities of the Pope in any other view for the exercise of his high and mighty office.* It is a

* There have been Popes in past time more hard to get along with, in this view, than Pius IX. Even in his case, however, it requires a very stout faith, to join

magical appendix belonging to the office itself, which all men are bound to accept as the rule and measure of their faith without regard to any conditions whatever holding in the material object of their faith otherwise considered. All hinges on the form of the faith, as an act of blind submission to the authority of him who claims to be the mouth-piece of our Lord Jesus Christ in Rome. Were he a Caiaphas or a Balaam, he must still be trusted in implicitly as being for the time the infallible high-priest and prophet of God. We mean here no caricature. The Vatican decree if we understand it, comes just to this, and nothing less than this. A hard saying, intelligence and conscience may exclaim; who can hear it? But then intelligence and conscience are roughly reminded that the unbelieving Jews (John vi. 60), used the very same language toward Christ Himself; and that the first law of the Christian kingdom is the bringing into captivity of all thought and intelligence to the obedience of Christ.

The harder the cost of faith in this view, we are told, the greater the merit and the power of faith. That indeed is the

the conception of infallibility firmly and calmly with what seem to be the incommeasurable personal qualities of the man otherwise considered. Take him in his ordinary human character, and he is represented as having been always noted for a certain frivolity of spirit joined with a self-willed impatient temper. He never had any taste for theological studies. Gregory XVI. had no confidence in him, and predicted that if he ever became pope he wou'd ruin the Church. Originally in the interest of the Liberals, he threw himself after his flight to Gaeta into the hands of the Jesuits, who now use him as clay is used by the potter. They relieve him of the trouble of thinking. They do his science for him by proxy. Pa saglia declared that even after he had signed the decree of the *Immaculate Conception* he knew not what it meant. It is known generally in Rome, that he reads no book, but only small pamphlets and some journals. With all this he is given to free talk, in a loose, imprudent way. "For my part," said a Roman ecclesiastic to Prof. Friedrich in Rome, "I need no other argument that the Pope is not infallible than this, that I have never in all my life met with a man who was less exact with the truth, than just Pius IX." His superstition knows no bounds. He fancies himself the subject of special inspirations, which have for him the force of fixed ideas, and go farther with him at times, even in serious affairs, than any other reason. These things are drawn from Friedrich's *Tagebuch*. Now the problem is, how to think the endowment of personal infallibility into such a personality. Pius himself finds no difficulty in the matter. "When I was the Abbot Mastai," he tells us, "I believed in papal infallibility, but now as Pope Mastai I *feel* it." It is with him a matter of intuition.

very sense of the famous or rather infamous *sacrificio dell' intelletto*, which the military spirit of the school of Loyola has now made to be the soul of all religion in the Roman Church. It means the slaughter of the understanding, the immolation of the will, the conversion of all free personality on the part of men into the passive obedience of a corpse. And for such faith, it must be confessed, the late Vatican decree offers an admirable lesson to begin with. It is here *multum in parvo*, or rather all in a nutshell. That it goes against conscience, and delivers reason bound hand and foot over into the hands of the uncircumcised Philistines, only fits it the more to serve its own end; only makes it a more suitable engine for grinding into the souls of men the cadaverous faith of the Jesuit.

That the action of the Vatican Council, revealing to the world such a complete triumph of Ultramontanism, should have called forth open resistance and protest in the Roman Catholic Church, is not to be considered strange. The only wonder is, considering what had place before and during the Council, that the opposition should not have been more widespread and serious than it has yet proved to be in fact. Nothing could well go farther to show the dread power of the system which has now got the Papacy fully into its hands, and whose attitude at this time amounts to a bold defiance hurled toward the powers of the world's civilization in every other form.

In France, the voices that were heard from high places against the new doctrine before the 18th of July, 1870, have since ceased to be heard. The Sorbonne and the Episcopate have together wheeled into line. The memory of Bossuet is dishonored, and the Gallican liberties are turned into reproach. How it has fared with the German Bishops, we have already seen. They recanted, all of them, their own good confession made before their going to Rome, and also during their stay in Rome; some of them not without much tribulation of spirit; and are now moving heaven and earth to oppose and put down the very truth which they themselves before confessed. And with some at least of our North American prelates (in Canada and

the United States), it is known there has been just the same tergiversation. Disgusted with the course of things in Rome, they have learned to see nevertheless, since their return, that all was right, and are now ready to insist on the infallibility of Pius IX, as no less certain for faith than the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All this is marvellous; and it is not strange that zealous Romanists see in it an argument for the œcumenicity of the late Council, a sort of divine seal openly impressed upon it by the hand of the Almighty Himself. The world has not known a larger council, nor one of apparently more overpowering force. But all depends on the nature and character of this force. Has it been of heaven or of men? Is the unity that has followed it a living unity, or is it rather the unity of death? There is room for this question: and it may be so answered that the present seeming triumph of Ultramontanism shall be construed into a sign of weakness rather than strength, a handwriting of judgment on the wall rather than a bow of promise in the cloud. This construction has been put upon it in fact by the new race of reformers which has sprung up in the German Catholic Church. They see in it only the doom of Belshazzar and the fall of Babylon.

This old Catholic Movement, as it is called, dates from the 18th of July, 1870, when the Vatican Council pronounced the infallibility of the Pope a necessary article of the Christian faith. It grew forth from the integrity of those who had previously protested against the introduction of this dogma as subversive of the ancient Catholic truth, and who now held themselves bound to stand firm to that good testimony, even when their own ecclesiastical leaders shamefully fell away from it, and when confession was seen to mean for them nothing less than martyrdom of the soul in the most serious form. As Prof. Reinkens shows with great force in the article translated for last number of this REVIEW, it was through the birth throes of *conscience*, the great question of personal spiritual responsibility over against the imposition of blind outward authority, that the new strange life made its appearance in the Catholic world; and

what served in this way to originate the movement at first, has been the true silent power of its growth ever since, as it is that also which imparts to it all its significance for the time to come.

The memorable Letter of Dr. Döllinger to the Archbishop of Munich (a new careful translation of which precedes our present article) is of special historical interest as related to this latest effort for the reformation of the Catholic Church. No man has stood higher heretofore in the confidence and admiration of his own communion; as indeed no one has been more of an ornament and credit to it in the eyes of the general Christian world. His venerable age, his vast historical learning, his exemplary Christian piety, his high position, all have contributed to make his Letter an object of universal attention. Its words have gone forth to the ends of the earth, and though very calm and quiet in themselves, have fallen upon the ears of men, like thunder; louder by far than the *brutum fulmen* of excommunication with which they were immediately followed on the head of their author from the high and mighty prelate to whom they were addressed. As related to the old Catholic Movement, this Letter of Döllinger is more than an ordinary spoken or written word; it is a grand dramatic deed, like Martin Luther's nailing of his theses on the church door in Wittenberg. He is a very different man, indeed, from Luther; but it is quite possible (under God's ordering) that this act of his, in the years hereafter, may be looked back upon as of no less world-historical meaning than the Wittenberg act itself.

Its importance in such ultimate view is not to be determined, of course, by the mere beginnings of the movement to which it belongs. These have not been of a character to overpower the judgment of the world at once in their favor. The first demonstrations made against ultramontanism in Bavaria, have not come to as much as they seemed at first to promise. On the part of the government, especially, there has been a serious backing down of zeal, a reactionary policy tending to demoralize the course which it first affected to favor as its own. All the force of the thoroughly organized and drilled regimen of

the Jesuits (the fruit of a whole generation's previous training) making itself felt in the meantime on clergy and people, has come in to create the impression of overwhelming mass and weight on the other side. All this has led many to look upon the Old Catholic cause as a failure. Its enemies have taken pains to speak of it in this way, in a tone of insulting derision, like that of Tobiah the Ammonite in the ears of the proud Sanballat, (Nehemiah iv. 1-3.) But not these only; the friends of the movement also, in different parts of the world have been led too generally to think of it, and speak of it, with similar distrust. It has not fallen in with this or that preconceived notion of what church reformation ought to be; it has shown itself too tame, too cautious, too slow; it has not come with sufficient noise and observation. And so it is set down for a well-intentioned fiasco, a stream doomed to run itself out in the sand.

And yet we do not need surely to be told that noise and tumult are not always the demonstration of deep and lasting power. How often is silence in fact the argument of the greatest strength. The kingdom of God, it is said, cometh not with outward observation. In the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, it is "a stone cut out without hands," which nevertheless having broken in pieces the kingdoms of the world, "became itself a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." This does not prove that the Old Catholic movement is destined certainly to break down the image of the Roman Papacy in the end. But it does show this much at least, that the impatient judgments pronounced against it thus far, whether by Romans or Protestants, have in them no sort of conclusive force. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts," is a prophetic word, which, if the movement should turn out to have been indeed of God, would be in no sense contradicted, but only verified and made good by what is thus objected against it as its present show of weakness.

No one seems to feel this more fully than the apostle of the movement, Dr. Döllinger himself. There is not in him a particle of the impetuosity of Ronge; nothing in him even of the

impassioned ardor of Pere Hyacinthe. The great theologian of Germany is reserved, calm, almost at times frigid. He is not disturbed by events, whether favorable or unfavorable. In conversation he speaks but little, and with simplicity. His words are distinguished always, for their force, though rarely for their eloquence. He is more passive in his conviction than active, throwing himself on the force of ideas, and quietly leaving results with God. Fault has been found with him for this; but there is that in it also which is suited to inspire respect both for the man and for his cause. On being complimented on a certain occasion for his heroic opposition to the usurpations of Rome, he replied: "I neither expect nor fear anything from that; the world congratulates me as if my position were something great; I am but as a duck thrown into the water which can do no otherwise than swim." The abuse of the ultramontane journals he allows to pass without reading; "I know the authors," he says, "and that is for me enough. They can make of me a saint or a cannibal; in neither case will they speak the truth." One having spoken to him sorrowfully of the defection of a friend who had vigorously combated the infallibility decree, his answer was: "I see that troubles you, but it does not disturb me, I am used to it. These bishops, and these theologians, who were one thing yesterday and are another thing to-day, remind one of acrobats on a tight rope, who must do all sorts of turning to preserve their equilibrium." When he heard of the final adhesion of Mgr. Maret to the Vatican dogma, he repeated the two lofty lines of Juvenal:

*Summum crede nefus animam preferre pudori,
Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas.*

A great man truly, and worthy of the cause he represents; although no one can be more sensible than he is himself, that the cause is in no sense dependent on either his own name or his own life. He is in the 75th year of his age. "I am an old man," was his language more than a year since to a friend; "I shall not live long enough to see all that is coming. But what has begun well must end well; there will be a radical reform of the Church; of that I am sure."

The work has in fact gone forward apart from the sage of Munich, and to a large degree independently of his counsel or guidance. Younger and more vigorous men, thoroughly fitted for the task by natural talent, full education, and self-sacrificing devotion, have taken hold of it, and urged it onward with what must be considered in the circumstances a truly wonderful success. It has gone far beyond Munich and Bavaria, and is felt all over Germany, and into Switzerland and Austria. Not yet as an outward whirlwind, certainly (unless we choose to take the blustering wrath of the Romanists in certain quarters for that;) but what is much better, as a powerful leaven, that may be found more effectual for its object in the end than any whirlwind however strong.

If there might have been any doubt of this living and progressive, though comparatively silent character of the work previously, the meeting of the Old Catholic Congress last September in Cologne was well suited to put an end to it. The world has seldom seen a more imposing or solemn religious convention. Such was the view taken of it by intelligent observers present on the occasion, from this country and from England, who reported at the time their highly favorable judgment through the press; and the official account of the proceedings which has since appeared, abundantly confirms their testimony. This official account is in fact a volume of nearly 250 pages, got up in the best style and with the greatest care, which with its full stenographic reports may be said to daguerreotype for the reader the entire occasion, so that it is made to pass before him in its details very much as if he had been personally present. And few books of the sort certainly, made up of business minutes, debates and speeches, may compare with it for commanding interest and solid instruction. Once introduced to its pages, no one at all awake to the present state of things in the world, can fail to follow it with more than ordinary attention to the end. It is indeed a most suggestive study for the times; for the significance of that Cologne meeting reached in fact, as the thoughtful reader is forced to feel, far beyond its own immediate occasion, far beyond the three

days of its memorable sitting, and far beyond the goodly old town of Cologne in which it was held. It took hold in truth morally on the ends of the earth, and had to do with the deep foundations of the world's life. In this respect it was ecumenical and world-historical, quite as much as the Vatican Council itself, or as the Evangelical Alliance is expected to be (the great antithesis of the Vatican,) which is to sit next September in New York. Not since the age of the Reformation at least (and perhaps not even then,) has there been a more imposing or momentous demonstration in the bosom of the Christian world, called forth by the inmost needs of the Christian world in the same broad and profound view.

The outward composition of the body was all that could be asked to make it respectable. Upwards of four hundred regular delegates took part in its business proceedings from the beginning; chosen representatives of the cause from Germany and Austria; to whom must be added quite a list of guests, as they were called, partly also from Germany and partly from Great Britain, America, France, Italy, Russia and Hungary. Among these guests figure conspicuously the Anglican bishops, Brown of Ely and Wordsworth of Lincoln, together with Whittingham of Maryland, from this country. An unusual amount of intelligence showed itself in the assembly. Besides its four business sessions, two public meetings were held in the large Gürzenich Hall, where a succession of addressees were made to vast audiences of the most stirring and telling kind. One is surprised to meet with such a constellation of new names, bursting here suddenly into view, and throwing their light far and wide over the Christian world. It is something we were not prepared to look for from the Roman Catholic life of Germany; and it goes far of itself in this view to create a strong impression in favor of the Old Catholic cause, as having been able to draw what seems to be thus the better part of that life into its service. It is no wonder that the distinguished strangers present from England and America were struck with the imposing character of the Council and its proceedings, and felt themselves constrained to speak of it with admiration and

respect. One thing it showed clearly. The Old Catholic movement in Germany was not in weak hands, and it was much more than an excitement suddenly got up and as suddenly to pass away. There was mind in it, method and power; and it was able to take care of itself, as it meant also to take care of itself, and to follow its own course, with full independence of all outside guidance or help. Döllinger was there, and was hailed on his appearance with a hearty cheer as the Nestor of the cause; but he only spoke once, briefly on a secondary point in debate, and then the vote of the body went against him.

The business of the convention had been well prepared for it with great care and labor, before it came together, by commissioners previously appointed for the purpose, in the form of general schemes which were published and in the hands of the delegates: so that they were ready to act promptly on all questions claiming their action as soon as they came forward. To this must be added a most excellent order or method of deliberation, and the advantage of such rare judgment and tact in the presiding officer, Herr Prof. von Schulte, as has been seldom met with (by the confession of all) in the conduct of such bodies. The convention in this way accomplished a great deal in a short time. There was no room in it for desultory declamation or mere buncombe talk. There was no confusion or chaos in its proceedings. All meant business; serious, public business; and of such business there was transacted an amount, that for form and quality well deserves to be a study, and that cannot fail, the more it is studied, to command attention and admiration. It is not just what outside criticism, at home or abroad, may have impatiently supposed it ought to have been; but it is only for this reason all the more worthy of regard. The promise of the work lies in what we may call its indifference to immediate, noisy or flashy results of any kind, in the breadth of its circumspection, in the depth of its penetration, in its slow caution, in its reliance upon the power of ideas, in its secure faith with regard to the future.

We cannot go here, of course, into any consideration of the

work of the Congress in its details. Our concern with it at present is under the general view simply, of the light it has served to throw on the sense of the Old Catholic movement, in the history of which it holds now so conspicuous a place.

This movement, we are told, was born of a meeting held informally in Nuremberg, not long after the Vatican decree. It came to a more formal organization afterwards, in the Munich Congress of 1872. But all was still necessarily more or less provisional and tentative in its character. The forces at work in it were as yet largely obscure, indefinite, and so of course chaotic. Could the chaos ever grow into a creation? It was easy and not unnatural to answer this question in the negative. Romanists took pleasure in speaking of it as a failure; and Protestants, in Germany and elsewhere, were very generally inclined to think of it in the same way. But the Congress of Cologne taught the world a different lesson. The movement, it appeared there, was neither dead, nor moribund, nor in a state of sleep; but was powerfully alive and awake; and more than this, gaining force and ready to pass from its first stage of chaos into its higher second stage of clear, self-conscious, intelligible order. It has been like a vision of the Church coming forth once more from the catacombs. All felt this who were in Cologne at the time of the Congress; and no one anywhere can help feeling it who has made its transactions a matter of study since.

“I bring you greeting,” says Prof. Huber, addressing the immense audience assembled in the Gürzenich Hall “from Bavaria and Munich, a greeting that betokens unbroken courage and self-sacrificing endurance for the great cause which has brought us here together. As the Old Catholics of Germany came before the nation a year ago, to declare the ideas that move them, and the end for which they strive, so is it here again to-day. When I look back over the year which has since passed, I find it a year of variable fortunes, a year of tumultuating conflict, in which many victories have been won, though not without some disappointments. Altogether, however, our success has been so great, that in the face of every

discouragement both hope and courage may well be animated for the fight which is yet to come. On the field of general public opinion our enemy is everywhere discomfited ; there is no thinking man who would yield himself in faith to the decrees they have tried to force upon us from Rome. Nor is it simply with the cultivated class, or in cities that such mistrust prevails ; among our plain country population also there is felt a gnawing doubt, more and more, of the Roman hierarchy. A dark suspicion has entered into the soul of our people : there is going forward in the soul of the German people just what our hierarchists fear, a movement that is shaking the whole false structure which they have sought to prop up with the decrees of the Vatican. But this negative movement is not all that is at work in the popular mind. Along with it goes another that is positive, and by which the question of true religion is brought to the front of free public discussion. The best and most earnest minds of the nation are now grappling with this subject. What the indolence of other times forgot and overlooked, is forced by the events of the present time more and more upon the world's consideration ; this namely, that nihilism no less than superstition injures the being of a people in its inmost marrow. And now all these earnest minds, these deeply thoughtful spirits, which are inquiring into the principles that lie at the ground of man's existence, are for us so many allies in our work. For two years past the German nation has been put upon the study of theology, as perhaps not before since the age of the Reformation ; especially in Germany is the question of the Church explored. The book of Church History is spread out before the people, and all may read in it who wish to read. We are learning to know the causes of the wrong state of things from which we now suffer ; we are learning the causes of the divisions that rend the heart of Christendom. And finding that it is to the passions of men and much hasty error these mournful divisions are to be ascribed, we are all touched with a sentiment that looks actively toward reconciliation. These, my honored hearers, are the positive workings of our activity. A new, moral, earnest spirit, a spirit of placability and peace, has been

awakened, and we can trust this spirit, that it will in due time complete the work in which it has become our glorious duty to take part."

"Allow me now," the speaker goes on to say, "to turn from these general considerations to something special. I have brought you greeting from Bavaria, and you may be interested perhaps to know how it fares with our movement there. When we held our first religious service a year ago in the Gasteig Chapel, a small out-of-the-way church, it was an anxious question with us whether people enough would follow us to fill the little building ; and lo ! not only has the small church been constantly filled, but there has been a call for more room. It is a felt need in Munich, that the Old Catholics should have there a large church. Had our Government shown its liberality towards us more in deeds and less in words, had it granted us one of the churches which it could have given us—I speak from the fullest conviction—half Munich would be openly joined to us this day. And as it is, thousands as things are having been kept back from such open adhesion, I can proclaim it still as a truth, no less certain and sure, that neither the people of Munich nor the Bavarians belong any more to our foes. All over the country congregations are springing up. We have a flourishing one in Mehring. Another has been formed in Kempten, and from there the whole Allgäu is drawn into the compass of our activity. In Straubing, Passau, Regensburg, Simbach, Erlangen, you can find steps taken toward congregations. In Nuremberg, Fürth, Bayreuth, in all the cities of Bavaria, we are met with the same phenomenon. The entire Palatinate is overspread with our adherents. And as our friends were called last winter to the mass meeting, in Kiefersfelden, the country people of the Inn valley and of the mountains poured in by thousands to hear the word of truth. Like a cloud the movement rolled over the valley of the Inn ; as lightning it passed from Kufstein to the foot of the Brenner. A flourishing congregation belongs to us here in Cologne, and from Crefeld to Constance all is in motion. In Switzerland our friends are actively at work, and though the

outward show amounts not yet to much, the course of things inwardly is full of promise. On the extreme eastern boundary of the German Empire we have congregations, served by Pastor Grunert, Professor Michelis and Dr. Wollman; and all Austria is in like manner apprehended by the Old Catholic spirit."

This is a long extract, but it serves better than anything we could present in a different way to bring into view what this Old Catholic spirit had brought to pass when it reached the epoch of its Second Congress in Cologne, and what in the circumstances this Congress was, then, for the promotion of its further progress. The spirit which was in the movement from the beginning, came now more clearly to harmony and right understanding with itself; and from that time since, it has been working steadily and widely in one direction and another toward the same general end. Its power of self-regulation and self-restraint in this view has been wonderful. Among so many acting on their own judgment, and excited with the idea of wrong and reformation, it was but natural to look for more or less irregularity, precipitation and excess. But this has not taken place. There has been no iconoclasm in the work; it has given birth as yet to no Münzer, Carlstadt or Ronge.* Its

* It betrays most shallow thinking, whether among Romanists or false Protestants, to see in the Old Catholic movement a renewal simply of the "German Catholic" excitement headed by Ronge and Czersky in the year 1845. We denounced it at the time, as a scandal to Protestantism, that so many of our religious papers were ready to join hands with such a cause, as of one nature with the work of the Reformation in the 16th century. "Ronge," we then declared, "is no reformer, but a radical only, of the worst stamp. Like Luther he has indeed cast off the authority of Rome. But the resemblance of the two cases is merely in outward form. Luther was full of positive life; Ronge is negative wholly, and destitute of all faith in Christianity as a real life-revelation in the world. Luther stood in the element of the objective, and felt himself to be the passive organ only of the true and proper historical life of the Church itself; Ronge is supremely subjective, unhistorical and full of blind self-will. Luther was himself the first central, and in some sense fons-tal, product of the vast spiritual revolution in which he led the way; it came to the birth with deep convulsive throes, in his separate personal consciousness, before it revealed itself in the rest of the Church already ripe for the change. Ronge stands in no such relation to the inmost religious life of the age, in which he affects to play the spiritual hero." *Mystical Presence*, p. 151. All this was soon confirmed by the judgment of history. It has no application whatever to the cause of Döllinger and the Old Catholics. If ever a movement in the world was free from mere human interest, passion and self-will, showing itself the product of objective powers, and in that way truly historical, we seem to have it here.

principle is: Abide in the ship. Its great law: Organization first; then the reconstruction of true church authority; and then the doing away of disorders and abuses as the right life of the Church may require. Every step is taken with due regard to the demands of law, both canonical and civil, and with an eye to the maintenance of all church rights, regarded as belonging now to the Old Catholics in their character of being the Catholic Church in its only true and right form. "He that believeth shall not make haste," is the motto in this view, which is acting like a charm to moderate all things and keep them in the right direction.

Such is the tone of wisdom that runs remarkably through the opening address of Prof. V. Schulte, on taking the chair as President of the Cologne Congress. "We have this year," he says, "a greater and more difficult task than in the past year. Then we were still struggling for our existence; we knew not yet our position in the world; we had not got ourselves into constitution. The main point, that which in any case must appear the most vital for our movement, was on to the end of the first (Munich) Congress, completely in the dark, I mean the formation of congregations. Had the time come for it? There was room for doubt on the subject; but there was room on the other side also for the view, that the exigency had come to such a pass as to justify an advance to this great practical measure. It was resolved, accordingly, to go into the organization of congregations. We have to do now also with similar grave questions; and we must see that in dealing with them we avoid all self-contradiction, and hold ourselves steadily to the ground we have taken with good conscience and full faith from the beginning. We belong to the Catholic Church. The primary cause of our rising lay in this, that we were required to accept doctrines which were not God's word, but were only the invention of men put forward as the word of God. That was the *immediate occasion*. We have all known, however, that the true heart of Christendom has been for centuries demanding more in the way of church reform; and that the holding back of this *more* is what has produced division

in the Christian Church. We know that the oldest division had its ground, not in religious questions, but mainly in hierarchical pride. Our mission seems to mean then, that we should bend our whole strength to restore the sundered unity of the Church at large. But we must be aware that such an aim presupposes a clear perception of the dividing issues, and is not to be promoted by precipitation, or through the use of empty phrases and outward declamation. We have still other tasks. Our stand-point is : It is *not we* that have gone out of the Catholic Church ; we hold fast to the Catholic faith ; they have thrust us out and then declared us to be apostates. And who are *they*, that have done this ? Men, of whom we must say that they *have been* bishops of the Catholic Church, regularly chosen and rightly acknowledged ; but of whom we are now bound in conscience also to say, that having given in their adhesion to the new Vatican doctrine, the cause of all this rupture in the Church, they have lost for us the authority of bishops—we can obey them no longer. It was this going over of all the bishops, the entire episcopate, in *outward appearance* at least, to the Roman camp, which brought upon us the necessity that lies at the ground of our whole movement. We are in a strait (*Nothstand*) of practical life, of conscience and also of law. We have no tribunal ; we cannot bring our bishops, or the bishop of Rome, to account for having introduced an innovation that tramples the church under foot. We have no ecumenical council ; and being thus without resort, there is nothing left for us but to do for ourselves what church right allows, by carrying out practically the rules of this right. Our need goes still farther : not only the bishops, but the greatest part of the clergy also, the organs of the bishops, are with the new cause ; and the consequence is, that in many districts and dioceses Old Catholics are cut off from the exercise of their religion. The sacraments are refused them, they are insulted in the churches, they are excommunicated from the pulpits. Such need justifies at once the provision of proper pastoral care for our congregational life. But this must be under right regulation. We have behind us the experience of a year, and the propositions

now before us aim at a more exact organization. They are in gross and whole very moderate ; and I believe nothing will help our cause more than our holding fast with both firmness and moderation, to what I have now described as our true stand-point."

We have here what may be taken as the key-note, not only of all that took place at the Cologne Congress, but of all that the movement has brought to pass since. As far as we can understand it through the pages of the *Deutscher Merkur*, it seems to be following out steadily on all sides the peculiarly distinctive programme laid down for it by its leaders, with quiet but sure success, and is in a fair way of reaching in due course of time the order that is required to give it the full acting powers of a reconstructed Catholic Church. This is felt to require bishops and a general council. Only when thus organized in full, will the body be considered competent to go into the work of reforming particular abuses ; the business, which so many have thought the movement should have been concerned with from the beginning, and for the neglect of which its leaders have been charged with unfitness for their task in different quarters. And only then also will the way be open for moving positively in that great work of the reintegration of Christendom, which as we have just seen Schulte (but not less Döllinger, Friedrich, Reusch, Huber, Reinkens, Michelis, Knoodt, and every one of this noble band of confessors) dares to look forward to as the highest aim of the work with which they are engaged.

But strange to say, this crowning measure of an episcopate is itself approached only in the most slow and cautious way. There is no thought evidently (as with too many of our Anglicans) of any magical potency in the office and name of bishops, as though all right church-life must start here, and this were needed first of all to authenticate and uphold our apostolic faith. There is a commission appointed (made up of seven strong names, Friedrich, Hasenclever, Maassen, Reusch, Michelis, Schulte, and Wülfing), to whom is entrusted the duty of determining when and how the business of choosing a bishop

shall go forward. We see it stated, that instead of a single bishop it is proposed now to have at once three—one for North Germany, a second for South Germany, and the third for Switzerland. But why such holding back in the matter of the episcopate? From the feeling, that however necessary it may be as the cap-stone of a complete church structure, such structure requires first of all a certain organization and consistency in itself, as it were from below upward, to make the imposition of the cap-stone entirely safe. These men are Germans after all, not Anglicans; and their freshly recent experience of bishops has been of a sort, that may well excuse them for regarding the office with a certain amount of jealousy and distrust. In any case, their bishops, as they are careful to inform the world, are not to be lords nor men of high outward estate. The office must be spiritual and not secular. The institution must return to its primitive idea.

"In proceeding to the election of a bishop," says Prof. V. Schulte, "we need to be first of all fully clear in regard to what his relation is to be to our congregations, what power, what rights he is to possess. For this, we cannot just refer to the body of canon law and later papal bulls. The bishop must stand to us in the relation demanded by the true conception of the Christian Church. He must be a father, a shepherd; not a prince ruling us by vicariate orders with legal frigidity and unloving soul, but a father speaking the language of the heart and of Christian love."

Prof. Michelis, on the same subject, rises into a sort of prophetic exaltation, as if he felt the choice of a bishop to be after all but a secondary circumstance in the moral grandeur of the general movement in which it was to find its place.

"I am opposed," he says, "to fixing a time for the election of a bishop, on the principle that the basis of our whole movement, that which makes my participation in it a matter of conscience, holds for me in the conception of actual exigency and need. My inward confidence in the Catholic Church and her truth, has not suffered, from all we have passed through, so much as the very slightest change. I am often looked upon as an

idealist. I have indeed always viewed the matter in theory, as it has now become for me practical also by the infallibility decree. The truth of the Church has been for me independent always of the miserability of circumstances and men. That this miserability meets me at present in a degree, which in former times might perhaps have crushed me dead, I am ready to allow; but it cannot do that now. Not a particle of my Catholic conviction has yet been disturbed; and just this conviction it was, this Catholic conscience, that led me, without complaint, as soon as the decision of Rome took place, openly to declare in the clearest and most distinct terms my determination, to stand up for the truth of the Church against this frightful perversion. That is my principle and rule; to follow the conduct of necessity, and not to run ahead of it. So we have done the last year in the matter of congregations; and I believe our cause to be so much farther advanced at present, that the restoration of the episcopal office is becoming for us now also a similar need. But it is not such as calls for action just at once. And I know not if the right time may be for it within three months or six, or even within the term of a year. At this moment we stand before an extraordinary crisis. I believe—it is only my personal conviction indeed, but every one has to govern himself by that—I believe that the course of our whole cause, as things are now around us, is going to be altogether extraordinary. As I view the case, we have come to a crisis, a grand interior point of decision in the history of humanity, in world-history, such as has not had place probably since the birth of Christ, certainly not since the commencement of the Middle Ages. And I may be allowed, I trust, without offence, to give utterance to the uplifting thought; yes, we have felt it, how in a truly marvellous manner a higher hand moves in the history of the world. For me it is no chance, that the declaration of infallibility falls in with the conflict of Germany for her true existence. We see thus the relations of the time gathering themselves under our eyes into a crisis, which of itself makes it impossible that our cause, as some have feared, should run itself out in the sand. I have myself had no such

fear, not even for a moment. Can we then be so weak as to grow faint and weary, when we are not met at once with full success? We are on the eve, I repeat, of a grand crisis. Let us commit ourselves to the course of events. Possibly in a few months the choice of a bishop may become a necessity. Thanks to the services of the Archbishop of Utrecht, it is not that now. How soon it may come to be so depends on circumstances in the future. A premature choice, a choice made without absolute need, would be a hindrance for the work we have in hand rather than a help. We *might*, by God's grace, get a man who would be wholly after God's heart. But who is to go bail for that? It is quite as possible for us to make a mistake, and so damage heavily our own cause. It is in this way a dangerous experiment. With me, the one simple maxim of necessity is decisive; when it is absolutely a need, let the choice take place, but not sooner. My own confidence in the progress and success of our movement rests on the unshaken trust I have in the divine conduct of world-history, in the Church of Jesus Christ, and in the moral force we are bringing to bear on this conflict. But this moral force consists not at all in our having just at once a bishop, but in this rather: that with our small resources, in the heavy pressure that is now upon us, we hold out and yield not; working on in the narrow, small sphere in which we have worked thus far, with unwearied holy zeal and patience. In patience lies our strength and salvation; but the immediate choice of a bishop would seem to proceed rather from impatience, and therefore I like it not."

To some the language of Professor Michelis in regard to the world-historical momentousness of the work in which the Old Catholics are engaged may sound extravagant. But it will not seem so to those, who, looking to ideas more than to outward appearances, have taken pains to study the work in its own character, and in the light of the relations with which it is surrounded.

It is not of an accidental or sporadic nature in the progress of the world's general life. It belongs to the central stream of this life as it comes before us in Christianity; and is here in

the direct historical line of what has been for centuries the grand ruling question of the Christian Church, the problem of church reform having for its object the rectification of the disorders and miseries of the Church. It is a pitiful view of the case, which makes it to be a protest simply against the definition of the Pope's infallibility on the 18th of July, 1870, without regard to other previously existing vast abuses in the Roman Church. This is regarded only as the culmination of a system which had been at work long before, but only came now at last to the point of direct open antagonism to the whole idea of Christianity, making it necessary for the Christian conscience to save itself by equally open and full revolt. This is what is so well shown by Professor Reinkens in his popular tract *Conscience and the Vatican*. The system in question is the so-called Papal System, which grew up in the Middle Ages, basing its pretensions on notoriously false historical premises ; which sundered the Western or Latin Church from the Eastern or Greek Church ; which affected to comprehend in itself all powers both civil and ecclesiastical ; which drew after it sore disorders and manifold abuses in the Christian world, palpable to all men ; which stoutly fought off all attempts toward inward reformation, and so forced upon Europe the violent outward Protestant breach of the 16th century ; which gave birth to the Society of the Jesuits, and, which has now at last yielded itself fully to their power, in what must be considered a monstrous crusade against the political freedom and the universal intelligence of the modern Christian world. The Old Catholic movement is directed against what it assumes to be the tyranny and wrong of this Papal System, exercised through ages in such vast style and now brought to its full climax in the late Vatican decree. In this view the movement is itself but the historical continuation of that opposite power in the Church, which has been all along active for its redemption from what Luther has called its Babylonish captivity, the dominion of the Papacy ; though never as yet with any proper success. What the reformers before the reformation labored for ; what the great councils of the 15th century struggled in vain to reach ; what Protestantism in its different way undertook to bring to pass in the century following, with as

yet also only most imperfect success ; namely, deliverance of the Catholic Church from the yoke of the Papacy, without harm to the true original life of the Church, and the re-constitution of Christianity, thus, under a form making it possible to bring its most melancholy divisions to an end ; this old endeavor, the burden of the world's history for so long a time, is the same work which has now come also into the hands of these Old Catholics, and which they feel themselves commissioned of God to conduct to its triumphant end at last in a way answerable to the antichristian climax that has been reached on the other side. And if this be so, who will say that their position is not one of solemn grandeur, or that it may not have to do indeed with a crisis equal to any that has been known since the time of Christ ?

The tremendous nature of the general issue which runs through this conflict of ages, and which has now come to such a final life and death struggle as never before, we have already seen. It turns on what is for men the fundamental problem of their existence, the right practical adjustment of its individual and general sides, the principle of freedom in one direction and the principle of authority in another. We are not of those, it is well known, who worship the idea of individual liberty blindly, and see all danger for life only in the idea of outward authority and power. Freedom centering in mere selfhood, we well understand, is not true freedom, but false licentious freedom ; and by that sin the angels fell. For years we have been doing battle, from pulpit, rostrum and press, with the popular idols of private judgment and private will, and insisting on the divine right of objective government and law, against the different radical and revolutionary tendencies of the age. These tendencies are indeed dangerous, and threaten to sweep all political and religious interests into chaos. We need the true idea and power of the state, and still more the true idea and power of the church, to hold them in conservative restraint ; and just here it is, that the Roman theory finds, for minds in a certain state its most plausible argument and its most seductive attraction. But the abuse of freedom is no

reason for the destruction of freedom; and if the individual and simply subjective side of our life, thrown upon itself, tends only to evil, it is no less certain that its general and objective side, taken in the same separate way, tends also only to evil. In other words, authority is just as liable to be abused, and made ruinous to the welfare of men, as freedom. As there is a false freedom, so also is there a false authority; and a right regard to the great interests of humanity and religion requires that the one should be withheld just as much as the other.

When is it now, and how is it, that authority, being as it is of indispensable necessity for all our human life is liable to become thus false and wrong? We answer: Whenever it is dissociated from freedom, and made to stand toward men in a simply outward and mechanical relation. Authority and freedom are opposite, but not therefore contradictory conceptions; their opposition is polar; antithetic in order that it may become synthetic. Our human life includes in it both terms, in such sort that each is required to be the complement and perfection of the other. This cannot be by any outward conjunction or juxtaposition, but only through inward concretion. If the one is not thus concretely and livingly in the other, their relation ceases to be normal; and both become in fact mere formal abstractions, void of their own proper sense and power.

All dominion, power and authority among men are legitimate thus, only as they are found to be in order to personal freedom among men. This does not mean, of course, that human subjects are not to be in any case bound and coerced to what is right, beyond the free consent of their own judgment and will. Authority involves discipline (the sacrament of the rod), and freedom rests largely in the obedience of faith. But everywhere, and always, the power that is exercised over the children of men, if it is to be of a right character, must have for its object the training of its subjects to the highest ends of their existence, *through* the development in themselves of the spiritual and moral capacity which God has given them for this purpose.

The power of parents over their children in this way, is for the

emancipation of the children in the end ; as their true freedom can come effectually also only through their obedience to the power exercised over them thus for their good. Suppose in the case, however, a mere outside rule on the one side, and a mere blind automatic submission on the other, and who does not see that the family must be for those in its bosom a ministration of death rather than a ministration of life ?

What is true thus of all family government is no less true of all political government. The state is an essential mode or form of human existence, in which sovereignty is required to be exercised for the object of making all who are under it participant alike (according to their measure) of the political life belonging to the state as a whole.

And so it would seem it ought to be also with the authority of religion, especially with the authority of the Christian religion, and with the powers of the Christian church (the highest of all institutions ordained of God for making men complete in their existence), as related to the object of human culture in its universal view. Christianity, in the New Testament, claims to be in this way a principle of freedom and true humanization for men, beyond all the world had ever known before. Even the Old Testament, with all its externality, is a law of liberty and light, a discipline unto inward righteousness ; but how much more the New Testament. Here especially it is the *entrance* of God's word into the soul, that giveth understanding and makes the soul interiorly strong and free. Christ's words are "spirit and life." To follow Him, is not to walk in darkness, but to have the light of life. In so doing, it is said, "ye shall *know* the truth, and the truth shall make you *free* ;" this being the office and work of truth, and so also the only true idea of religion, that it should illuminate the understanding and inform or energize the will.

Or take the subject in a still higher view. We are taught by our Lord to pray : "Thy will be done in earth, *as it is in heaven.*" The highest conception of religion is, then, that it should be among men here below, what it is in the other world among the angels. But how is it now that the angels do the

will of God? Not in any way, most certainly, of following simply their own private judgment or impulse. Their service is bound by law; the will of God is for them an authority or rule coming from beyond themselves, just as really as it is this for the stars and planets in their courses. Of angels and stars alike it may be said: "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is *settled in heaven*. They continue this day according to Thine ordinances; for all are Thy servants." More than this; as the stars and planets are joined together in systems, *through* which then the law of nature takes effect upon them severally, so are the angels also joined together in hierarchies or heavenly polities, which mediate for them in the same way the word or law of God in its spiritual form. There are for angels thus, no less than for men here on earth, principalities and powers ordained of God for the use of general societies; which are for these societies, then, ministries and vicegerencies of God, channels of His grace, personal bearers and organs of His will; whom the societies, otherwise considered, are bound to honor and obey, as planets do homage to their central suns. So far the idea of objectivity reaches for the angelic life; but no farther. It does not turn the angels into dead nature forces, into winds, or flames of fire, or shining planetary orbs. They are not, even over against God Himself, and still less over against those who exercise authority upon them in God's name, mere passive organs of the Divine will, moving only as they are moved from beyond themselves; as a staff is moved, for example, by the hand of him who carries it, or a corpse by those who undertake to dress it for the grave. No; the angels have their own intelligence; their own will; their own self-moving life and action. All this in such sort, however, that their selfhood is as it were continually sunk in God, and devoted in spontaneous service to the well-being of the society of which they are a part. They *will* to do the will of God, and in their freedom cannot choose to do otherwise. The law they obey as from beyond themselves, is at the same time wholly in themselves. Authority and freedom are with them absolutely one; their law and their liberty each in the other; the liberty having in the law its

necessary matter or substance, and the law finding in the liberty its no less necessary form. As if the planets, now held blindly to their course, were made to have in them the light of inward intelligence, and with it the power of independent motion, to go where they might please, and should yet now of their own sweet pleasure move onward still as before, "forever singing, as they shine, the hand that made us is divine." So the angels do indeed, in their higher and more glorious heaven, show forth continually the praise of God, standing in His presence and swift to do His will. And this, we say, is the only true ideal, to be looked to and reached after in the culture of our human life, and most of all in this culture as it is required to go forward in the church. It must aim at least to bring those who are the subjects of it, to do the will of God on earth as it is done by the angels in heaven. It must be in order to freedom and truth in the inward parts. All its authorities, agencies and ministries must have this for their design and scope. Otherwise they cease to be true to the idea of religion, and are found thus false at once both to God and man.

But the Roman theory of Christianity and the Church, which after a thousand years has issued at last in the full-blown Jeśuitic doctrine of the late Vatican Council, stands as we have already seen in world-startling contrast with all this. It goes on the assumption that a free subjectivity on the part of men, and an effectual objectivity on the part of God, are incompatible terms; and that to avoid the manifest bad possibilities of the first, there is but one alternative; namely, such an outward enthronement of the second over all the spheres of our human existence as shall reduce them to a state of mere automatic dependence on this external sovereignty. For the licentiousness of freedom we have substituted thus the licentiousness of power; the false absolutism of Hobbes, in the political order, for the false liberalism of Rousseau. As a theory of God's general relation to the world, it is deism in its difference from theism; such a view of God, as excludes Him in fact from all real immanence in the life of the world (physical or moral), and exaggerates in such sort the idea of His

transcendence, that He is regarded as standing on the outside of it, and working it after His own plan in a purely mechanical way. The authority that binds, becomes in this way all in all; the existence and life which are bound, less than nothing. And so it is in the end that Christianity itself, the highest sense of humanity (if it be true), and the "perfect law of liberty," is turned into a tremendous law of servility, a sirocco blast from the desert, before which the fairest fruits of humanity are struck with the blight of universal desolation.

We mean no polemical rhetoric or rant, in what we say; and God forbid that we should trifle with the subject irreverently in any way; for it is altogether too solemn for that. Our object here is mainly description only, and not argument; the description being left then to speak for itself.

Is not this system in truth the hard military rule of Ignatius Loyola and the Society of the Jesuits, made now after three hundred years to be the soul of the Papal Church? Does it not hinge throughout on the principle of blind obedience to external authority, blindly accepted as the organ of God in the same outward view? Does it not demand, Moloch like, the immolation of the understanding, the immolation of the will, the slaughter in one word of all spiritual and moral independence, on the part of those who commit themselves to its grim embrace, in order to make sure, in this frightful way, of their own eternal salvation? And is it not then a necessary result of all this, that the entire authority of God in the Christian Church, thus outwardly apprehended, should be taken to lodge itself ultimately in the single person of the Pope (the apex of the system); and that he should be declared infallible (regardless of all inward moral conditions, since all goes here by a sort of magical outward clock-work), so as to be for men the visible presence as it were, and actual speaking voice, of our Lord Jesus Christ on the earth? Then all other bishops and priests, belonging to the system, are simply puppets in the Pope's hand; he becomes himself in fact the entire hierarchy. And as Louis XIV. dared to say of France, *I am the State*, so Pius IX. then may say also, *I am the Church*; as he has in fact

already allowed himself to say in a truly naive way, *I am the Church Tradition!* But who cannot see, how this does away completely with St. Paul's view of what the Church is as the Body of Christ? A body is a living organism, having its life and activity inwardly, not in its head only (much less in a wooden figure of its head), but in all its parts; just what this Papal system is in no way willing to allow.

And if there may be with it no free organic life in the ecclesiastical order, how should it be tolerated with patience in the civil and political order? Let the constitution of Boniface VIII., the badly famous *Unam Sanctam*, with its doctrine of the two swords, give answer. This medieval document is now re-enacted in the broad-daylight of the 19th century, and is a blow struck in fact at the political independence of all nations. Cardinal Antonelli tells the nations indeed, that it is not to be taken in full earnest; but it goes with the system, necessarily, and cannot fail to pass now from theory into practice (as it is already doing in Germany and other countries), with consequences which God only can foresee; consequences, of which the German bishops gave solemn warning in the Vatican Council, although they are now themselves doing all they can to precipitate them, if need be in civil war, upon their native land.

From such outward mechanical domination over individual consciences, and over the independence of families and statesa it is but an easy and necessary step onward to the claim of a like outward domination over all human culture, all science and, art, all education, all the higher interests of the world's natural life, regarded as having in them any reason or right to be at all, outside of the vast strait jacket of authority prescribed for them by the unenlightened mind of the Pope. That is the sense of the *Syllabus*. Even history, as a science, must adjust itself to this Procrustean bed. Döllinger, one of the greatest masters of history, challenges the attention of the Archbishop of Munich to facts, which if established should blow the decree of the Pope's infallibility to atoms. The only answer deigned him, is excommunication. Professor Schulte, another such master, tries to get attention also to an overwhelming array of his-

torical testimony; but he too is met only with a curse, the last argument, and here the only one, of those who, in their fond spiritual autocracy, feel themselves to be *kings*. "The church," we are told, "must control the decisions of the historian" (and why not then the decisions of the astronomer also as in the case of Copernicus and Galileo); "all history and all science must be studied from the central point of the papacy."*

What I have now brought into view, may serve to show the broad and profound meaning of the issue which is involved in the Old Catholic Movement. The question with which it is concerned has been at work for centuries, but never before under the same radical and urgent character as now. Around it are gathering more and more, whether with full consciousness or not, all the deeper forces of the world's life at this time; and it has now come to such a form, that it is hard to see how a full answer to it can any longer be delayed. That the world altogether is in the midst of a crisis of the most extraordinary sort is becoming continually more plain. Never was a great epoch heralded, not simply for the thought, but also for the very feeling of men, by a more impressive array of prophetic and admonitory signs. The concurrence of outward and inward forces, flowing together from different sides, in the age of the Reformation, was less striking. The only parallel to it is in what had place at the coming of Christ into the world; and it is not strange that some have been prompted to see in it, in this way, the actual counterpart of that first advent, the introduction of a new dispensation in fact, drawing with it in the end the full power and glory of His second advent.

"We are now plainly enough," says I. H. Fichte† "placed in a transition state, where slowly but irrevocably an era of a

* Are we to take it as a bold example of what an infallible Pope may dare to do in this way, or must it be taken for an unconscious self-ironizing *bull* of the Irish sort, that in the Vatican decree of Papal *Infallibility*, a mutilated utterance of Gregory the Great is gravely quoted so as to give a sense just the contrary of its real meaning, and the opposite of what all the learned world knows to have been the mind of that great and good man?

† *System der Ethik. Erster kritischer Theil.* 1850.

thousand year's duration is sinking into ruin, while the new world that is to rise out of the ashes of the old is hardly discernible as yet even in its rudimentary outline; directly around us threatening chaos, before us the heavy cloud of a still impenetrable future!" This was spoken nearly a quarter of a century ago, in view of the surging moral and political forces, revolutionary and reactionary, which were then at work among the nations of Europe. But who may not see with what accumulated sense it applies to the state of Europe and the world at the present time? Whenever before did a period of like brief duration precipitate upon the world's experience, such a succession of vast and mighty changes, as have gone forward, on both sides of the Atlantic, within the past twenty-two or three years? And who with the least faith in God can help seeing and feeling that these changes carry in them in some way the power of a common world-historical sense, and are conspiring rapidly toward a common world-historical purpose and end?

In the bosom of this universal crisis of the age it is, that the significance of the Old Catholic idea, the rehabilitation of the Catholic Church in its pristine character and form through an act of self-awakening from the thousand years' incubus of the Papacy—comes fairly into view. Looked at ideally and theoretically in this way, the movement is worthy of profound attention, and must be allowed to take its place among the higher apocalyptic signs and wonders of the age, even if practically for the time it should come to naught, or pass ultimately along with other movements into the service of some deeper and broader tide of reformation not yet in the thought of its present martyrs and confessors. The simple fact that it has made its appearance in Germany, after the Franco-Prussian war and contemporaneously with the resurrection of the German Empire, on the heels of the Vatican Council and the downfall of the Pope's temporal power, is enough to invest it for the thoughtful student of the times, with more than an accidental character and more than a transient interest. For it is not easy to feel, that Germany is not now destined, even more than in the 16th century, to lead the way in any great spiritual

revolution having to do with the religion and civilization of the Christian world.

It tells in favor of the cause again, that it is calling forth angry persecution on the part of its enemies, while it is characterized on its own side only by meekness, patience, sacrifice and persevering self-denial. The recreant bishops, with their army of vassal priests, have spared no pains to inflame the minds of an ignorant and superstitious laity, wherever it was possible, against the movement. Newspapers and tracts are at work, as well as pulpits, dealing out the most scurrilous abuse. Societies and public meetings are brought into requisition for the same purpose; and it is wonderful with what masterly effect. For although the Jesuits are gone, their educational drill is in full play. As an example, take the following graphic picture of the state of things in one region (the district of Münster), from the correspondence of the *Deutscher Merkur*, 23 Nov. 1862.

"Allow me," the writer says, "to describe our circumstances in a religious and political view, as not without much that deserves notice. The people here have been for centuries quietly disposed, under different forms of government, being of rather sluggish spirit, and without any turn for politics. They are nearly all Catholics. The clergy formed under the mild views of such men as Overberg, Kistermacher, Katerkamp, and Kellermann, were plain, simple, good-hearted. One scarcely noticed, when the body began to change gradually by the introduction of new men trained under wholly different influences. The Jesuits themselves, till quite recently, observed moderation. So came on the years 1869 and 1870. When Prince Hohenlohe for a political purpose brought up the question of infallibility, it awakened here only displeasure; it was viewed as an offence toward the Catholic Church, to take the thing as in earnest. So when the *Civiltà Cattolica* came out with its well-known article on the subject, everybody was angry, and pronounced it craziness. As, however, the matter grew more serious, the clergy declared almost with one voice, that it was impossible the infallibility of the Pope could be de-

creed. And now? They have all submitted. Not a man of them resists; while many have grown fanatical, and drag the people along with them. The pulpit, the confessional, and private talk, were made use of to introduce the dogma. The women were worked upon, and these drew the men with them, or forced them to submit. When the major part was won, recourse was had to stringency; the refractory were refused absolution; the faithful were stirred up against them and made to threaten them with loss in their worldly business. So things have come to their present pass. Nobility and clergy work in common for the absolute power of the Pope with great zeal. In the quickest possible succession missions have been held in the towns and villages to gain over the people; being forbidden to the Jesuits, they are carried on by the Redemptorists now under other names. Numerous associations have been formed, which stand under the immediate direction of the priests, young men's sodalities, brotherhoods, Catholic unions of all sorts, and no pains are spared to swell their membership to the utmost. These are called upon for public demonstrations; pilgrimages; torch-light processions; to found new associations, put down obnoxious journals, to help spread their own party sheets, to promote ultramontane views, or gather subscriptions to addresses; and all such calls they must unconditionally obey.—Looking at the different classes of society, we find the ultramontane interest followed by the entire nobility, by nearly all the office-holders as far as they are Catholics, and by the majority of those who live in the towns and villages; a part knowing better, but keeping their mind cautiously to themselves. The country people are protected in some degree against the course of things by their plain natural sense and their attachment to past custom; hence farmers' unions, headed by nobles, are now actively employed to bring them into the traces.—The schools are in the hands of the Vatican party, and exercise of course a vast influence. Everywhere the Catechism of Overberg is in use; which all along has had in it the question: "Is the infallibility of the Pope an article of faith?" followed with the answer: "No; it is no article of faith." Now,

however, new leaves have been printed, making the answer just the other way, *Yes*; and all the Catechisms having been called in, the old leaf in every copy has been torn out and a new one put in its place. Thus the new doctrine was brought in, and who to him who should now sell a Catechism with the old leaf. Only the excessive veneration in which the clergy are held in Münster territory could allow such a proceeding to pass without opposition. In this veneration the women go farthest, exalting particular priests at times into objects of fanatical devotion. These have then of course an almost boundless influence. All pains are taken to carry this man-worship to its highest pitch in favor of the person of the Pope. Devotion to him, entire self-immersion in his thought and will in genuine Jesuit spirit, is made to be the highest perfection; and so then, hate, curse, and persecution to any one who may in word or act oppose so holy a man. All manner of superstitious observances and fancies come in to help this malign humor; and as the greatest foe of the new tendency is the German Empire, this is especially abhorred, and a fond eye turned toward France. This can be felt in the tone of the party sheets, as it is shown also by the avoidance of patriotic festivals and in other ways.—To the great mass-pilgrimages, which were set on foot by the priests during the latter part of the summer, with the utmost possible show, in almost all places, as demonstrations against the German Government, are added now conventions of Catholic Unions, which count by the thousand and more, and aim at a consolidation with the immense Catholic Association of Mentz. The speakers openly threaten a mobilization against Bismarck. Such mass meetings have been held in Borken and Ahaus, and another is soon to come off in Coesfeld.—Altogether the results of the later clerical system in Münster territory may well give rise to concern. The blind subjection of the lower clergy to the bishop deprives them of all legal independence. By the Vatican decree the bishops are subjected to the Pope, and together with their clergy are but organs of his will whom the people must follow blindly. The Church, now ruled exclusively by the Pope,

takes hold on all the relations of life, and so we have a double kingdom. Here that of the Pope and his organs—the clergy and clerical associations ; there the State, with its officers and its army. The Pope claims unconditional supremacy ; the State unlimited control in secular affairs. But as both assert their dominion over the same subjects, and both are bent on using their power to the utmost, the result must be a conflict, which can end only with the sore defeat of one side or the other. The body of the people stand before this danger without knowing what it means ; urged on all the time by their clerical leaders, and maddened through what they take to be persecution of the Church into ever greater hatred of the powers of the State. And as it is in Münster, so is it also in every region with a prevailing Catholic population. It is unmistakable that wires extend from France to Rome, and from Rome to Germany. Both France and Rome wish to reign ; they join hands that each may gain its end. France, for revenge, and Rome, for the spiritual mastery of the world, are ready to commit themselves if need be, to the violence of open war. What that would mean for the ultramontane party in Germany, in the way of calamity and sorrow, is very easy to calculate, when we consider the sound and resolute spirit of the German people as a whole, and their actual preparation to put down any hostile agitation when it once comes to acts and blows. On the Jesuits and their servile ‘German Bishops,’ more than on the Pope, rests the terrible responsibility of the case before the bar of God and of history.”

An outrageous display of the rising temper here brought into view occurred on the 23d of December last, at Lippstadt in Westphalia, where Prof. Michelis had gone by special invitation, to address a meeting of Old Catholics. As he was on a visit to a friend in the afternoon, a mob of more than a thousand of the Pope’s friends, “persecuted Catholics” as they call themselves, gathered whistling and shouting in front of the house, and crying out against the “heretic.” Undertaking to return to his hotel, he was set upon with stones (just four days before the festival of St. Stephen !) one of which struck him on

the head ; and the ordinary police proving unequal to the occasion, a company of soldiers had to be called in to disperse the crowd—the result being, several of the rioters wounded, and four of the ringleaders put under lock and key. To such bigoted madness has it come with the papal party ; and leading newspapers of the party only regret openly, that the penalty of the disorder should not have fallen in this case on the really responsible cause of it, Prof. Michelis and the Old Catholics who invited him to Lippstadt !

The outlook of things in Germany at this time, it must be confessed, is exceedingly solemn. There is an ominous sultry feeling in the air, boding no one can say what tempests and storms. Listen to the following passage from a Prussian jurist : “ The rabid spirit of the common people makes the danger for the State in the highest degree pressing and serious. If the controversy were between the educated, between parties as they commonly are, while the great body of the population continued in true reverence for the secular order, single laws and ordinances might be enough ; but it is the millions of which the opposition boasts, who are to be taken into account here, and whose violent onset is to be withheld. And verily, it is no mere blind onset of the masses. The clergy have been for years organizing with the utmost prudence and foresight ; they are ready ; they can handle the masses with the greatest ease, just as they wish. The enemy of the empire is in the heart of Germany ; his league with outside hostile powers is beyond question. Depend not on the supposed reigning culture. The present mingling of religion and the lust of power is well adapted to produce the wildest fanaticism, capable of developing a force and calling forth a destruction, that would soon turn your complacency into terror. You hold the number of the deluded to be small ? you think you have the cultivated on your side, and make calculations which leave the enemy but little force ? You are deceived ! Cast your eyes over the land. In congregations of 5000 souls there are not 5, who would dare to withdraw themselves from clerical direction. Visit the mass meetings, and learn the number and strength of their attend-

ance. Hearken to the abuse of the government, the scorn thrown upon the hated German Empire, and notice the applause with which it is received by the mighty crowds of people. The danger of the return of the Thirty Years' War presses continually nearer; all the distraction and hopeless misery of those terrible days threaten to come again on our fatherland."

The question of what the State should do, or refrain from doing, in such a trial as that to which the German Empire has now come, in its relations with the Vatican or Jesuitic Church, is of course one of great difficulty; and we pretend not here to go at all into its consideration. In any view, however, it must be carefully distinguished from the issue between the Old Catholics and this Church. The ground was taken in Cologne, that the only true succession of the Catholic Church in Germany is with the Old Catholics, that they have therefore a right politically to be so regarded and treated by the State, and that it is a self-stultifying and suicidal policy for the State *not* at once to acknowledge them in this character. But with all this, they hold themselves, in a way that is wonderful for Europe, rigorously aloof from all merely civil and political agitation. Their movement is no card, for government ends, in the hands of Bismarck or the German parliament. Their trust is not in politics in any way, but in the power wholly of moral and religious ideas, enforced by conscience and the Spirit of God.

On this subject we have a powerful address from Dr. Maassen, Professor of Law, in Vienna, in which he says that he had not been fully satisfied with one point made in the Munich platform of the previous year; this, namely, that "we reject the dogma of infallibility"—among other reasons—"because also it is dangerous to the State." Not that he questioned the truth so stated; for no one could be more fully convinced than he was, that the doctrine was in fact incompatible with the independent existence of the political order universally. But *that* was not properly a motive in this Old Catholic cause. For if the dogma were really from God, then it must be accepted even if the political order *had* to give way before it. The only justifying

motive for this cause lay in the blasphemous untruth of the dogma itself. Others might reject it on political ground, or even as rationalists because of their holding no faith in the gospel at all. "But *we* for the gospel's sake refuse to own the infallibility of a mere man." Yet as Christians and Catholics, he goes on to say, "we are also citizens of the State, and have the same right and interest with others, to deprecate the bearing of the dogma in question on the common national life." Not even then, however, as if the question must be considered of life account for the Old Catholic cause in any way. A full outward adoption of that cause on the part of the State would seem indeed a vast gain; but it would involve also a vast peril. "Our future, our trust stands in the truth of our cause itself and in the firmness of our convictions and our faith." For the State, however, he adds, though not for their cause, "it is *eine Lebensfrage*" — a question literally of life and death. The truth of this proposition he then proceeds to make clear, and charges home upon the Prussian government particularly a weak and vacillating policy in the case, altogether unworthy of the world-momentous crisis.

"But be the course of things here what it may," he adds in conclusion, "our stand-point is not affected by it in the least. For us Pope and Bishops of the Vatican Church are no longer Pope and Bishops of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church at present has no Pope, and with only a few exceptions no Bishops. If a Council of orthodox Bishops could be convened (a thing just now impracticable), Pope Pius IX., and all the Bishops who have accepted the Vatican dogma, would be deposed from their offices and dignities. No such Council being possible, the necessity of the situation is for us equivalent to its judgment. This would be non-allowable only under two suppositions: first, a doubt as to the actual falsehood and heresy of the Vatican dogma; secondly, a doubt as to its actual and persistent acceptance by the Pope and his consenting Bishops. But both these points are clear, beyond all need of any judicial inquiry. Pope and Bishops are *ipso facto* thus deprived of their offices and powers. In what other view, could our present Congress

take measures for choosing a new Bishop? For us it is a fixed fact, that Pius IX. is no more Pope of the Catholic Church, and that the Archbishops and Bishops who have bowed to the Vatican decree are no more Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic Church. This proposition is not uttered lightly; it is uttered by one who has looked toward these men with a sense of the most inward reverence, but who cannot yet shrink for a moment, where faith and conscience are concerned, from drawing the consequences on which only it is possible for faith and conscience to stand."

This address, we are told, was followed in the vast Gürzenich Hall with long-continued applause.

It remains yet to say something of the significance of the Old Catholic movement, as related to the subject of Church union. It is one of the observable peculiarities of the time, that the Christian consciousness under all forms (outside of the Vatican communion) is coming to be so much exercised with the thought that the existing divisions of the Christian world, back to the first grand rupture between the Oriental and the Western or Latin Churches, are something fatally wrong for Christianity, and that nothing is more necessary now than their removal to make room for its ultimate triumphs in the world. One may hear in this form as it were on all sides, "the voice of Him that crieth in the wilderness: Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God;" and feel also how the glorious promise hangs upon it: "The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." It is indeed a dreary desert that surrounds us now everywhere, through our reigning sect system (the bane of all the fruits of the Spirit as described in Gal. v. 22, 23); "a land where no water is;" a dry and thirsty land without dew, and where the heavens cease to drop down fatness. Who among us has not felt its blighting, narrowing, weakening, stunting influence upon our general spiritual life? And who that reflects can help seeing with Dr. Döllinger, that the divisions of the Church are the cause of all its other weakness, its loss of missionary

power, its too generally pusillanimous, if not absolutely driveling attitude over against the inrolling tide of our modern skepticism and unbelief? What a thought that Christianity has conquered as yet no more than a third of the world's population; that Buddhism is both older and in numbers stronger; that Islamism, the paralysis of nations, is still going ahead of it in the work of new conversions; and that now when the highway of commerce and travel is opened for it into all the dark places of the earth, it has so little power to irradiate them with its own light? For, alas, our missions, whether Catholic or Protestant, are not taking any effectual hold upon the world's heathen life. They are at best but a sort of colonized Christianity, foreign establishments kept up within narrow limits through foreign supervision and help, without any true seat in the life of the people where they are; hybrid births we may call them in the bosom of that life, that belong to it after all only in an outward manner, and so have no capacity for propagating themselves (by a native ministry for example) in any truly independent way. And why is all this? There can be but one answer. It is owing to the fearfully dismembered state of the Christian Church. What hope can there be for any whole evangelization of India, for example, through a dozen different denominational agencies, practically opposing one another in their conceptions of what Christianity is, and each trying to draw converts to itself in the weak, piping voice of a miserable, separate, merely human sect? It is high time, surely, that the cry should be going up as it is now from the true heart of Christendom all over the world: "Return, O Lord, how long? And let it repent Thee concerning Thy servants. Restore Thou the captivity of Thy people. O satisfy us early with Thy mercy; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil."

This piercing cry of the soul for the reintegration of the Christian faith and life in a form answerable to the original idea of Christianity, the necessary condition (according to the word of Christ Himself) of its own soundness and of its power

to conquer the world, becomes thus a measure and test by which we may try the spirit of all church constitutions at this time, so as to know whether they be of God truly or not. To be indifferent to what is so plainly now the inmost need of Christianity, or to be affected toward it in any way that is after all not really catholic or universal, but only sectarian and partial (the case with much of our popular declamation on the subject of church union), must be regarded in any case, as far as it goes, as an argument of defective church life, a presumption of questionable weakness with regard to all the main interests of this life; and so the opposite of such indifferent or superficial mind may be taken, in the case of any ecclesiastical cause, as the best proof of its being not of man but of God.

Applied to the Papal Church, this simple criterion is profoundly suggestive. That system has been notoriously the cause of the great division between the East and the West, through its tyrannical ambition and pride. It resisted all efforts made for the reform of the most crying abuses in the period before the Reformation; and so, in the sixteenth century, literally forced into existence that great Protestant secession, which has been the source of such endless division since. And through all this there has been no loving or yearning concern shown for a true inward healing of these sad breaches; but on the contrary a most unloving and stern intolerance of the very thought of union, except under the one condition of blind submission to a mere human autoocracy, which contradicts the idea of Christianity, and which all history proves to have been unknown in the beginning. And now a new issue (the necessary logical end, however, of all going before) is joined with the universal conscience of the Christian world, driving it to the wall, and turning into derision, as it were, the whole thought of Christian union. Rome, of course, has in this *her* theory also of a world-reconciliation in the end. But it is most uncatholic. It is that of an artificial mechanical uniformity, without any sort of inward free organization, a dead monotonous reign of law over men without the spirit of life in them. To aim at unity in this way is a contradiction; to dream of

reaching it, an absurdity. The policy of the Vatican is cold, and hard, and harsh ; it is against union rather than for it ; and it carries in it thus no power to conquer the world in the way of truth and righteousness.

“ Our hope for the Old Catholic movement,” says the earnest, whole-souled Dr. Reinkens, “ rests first of all in the *hopelessness* of the Ultramontane Church. Nothing in the world that is no longer capable of development can stand. That is an unchangeable law : what is incapable of farther development must go down. The catholicity of the Church of Jesus Christ has four characters, like love ; it has its height and its depth, its breadth and its length. Its height is its source in God ; its depth is the mystery, that it coins the eternally one into an endless variety and fulness of glorious forms ; its breadth is the expansive power it has to embrace all the nations of the earth in its band of love ; and its length is the capacity of Christianity for development through all ages, and along with this its capability of appearing always in forms answerable to each stage of culture. But Ultramontanism has no catholicity ; it is not Catholic, but Romish. It has, therefore, no height, for it springs from a few designing and ambitious men. It has no depth ; for it sees unity only in superficial uniformity. It has no breadth ; for it shrivels more and more together, has thrust off already half Christendom, is now causing new divisions, and will go on to shrivel till it vanishes from the earth. Finally, it has no length ; for it can develop no farther, inasmuch as with the dogmas of the Pope’s infallibility and autocracy, the system has got to its full end. The keenest wit of man is unable to see what more can come of it. That is God’s judgment upon Ultramontanism ; it must go down, because it has in it no power of farther evolution. And this is *our hope* : as Ultramontanism goes down, we grow ; for out of its ruins rise the disenchanted nations, which will then embrace the truth and feel themselves happy with us.”

Our Protestant sects, it is unnecessary to say, are also plainly unequal in their sect character to the task of restoring Christianity to its true form and power. With all the sense there

may be among them of the wrong and misery of our Church divisions (and as already said, there is a great deal of that now in all directions), still it is not in their nature, *as sects*, to seek honestly an end of these divisions in the way of genuine catholicity; as they have not in them either *as sects* the power of doing anything effectual toward bringing such catholicity to pass. And the consequence of all this, as may be easily seen, is a growing impotency among them in their own abstract order of existence, each coming to be more and more the outward form and shell only of what it was in the beginning. Thus are they also judged of God and found wanting. But of this we will speak no farther at present.

Regarded from the point of observation here brought into view, the Old Catholic movement, it must be allowed, does carry in it, as Dr. Reinkens intimates, a bow of hope and promise for the world, that may well fix upon it the serious attention of all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem. Even if it should come to nothing more, it has in it the force of a great lesson at least on the subject of Christian union, worthy of being studied and laid to heart by all parts of the Church.

It may be taken as God's signature upon the work, that it has been from the beginning not simply a protest against the tyranny of Rome, the great cause of the existing divisions of the Church, but an earnest overture, at the same time looking to the end of these divisions in the restored unity of the Church. That is felt to be the positive and full ultimate meaning of the movement, without which the merely negative oppositional side of it would be in truth of very small account.

So with Dr. Döllinger in his "Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches," which have found so favorable a response in Germany and also in other parts of the Christian world. In the same view again, we find the subject brought forward by Dr. Schulte, as already shown, in his address at the opening of the Cologne Congress; and it became part of the business of the Congress afterwards, as we know, to consider and act upon a report upon it, presented by a theological commission which had been previously appointed for the purpose. We can only

look at the matter here in the most general way ; our concern being mainly with the ruling principles and ideas, on which in the view of the Old Catholics this necessary side of the great Christian work in which they are engaged must go forward.

" In all efforts for the reunion of the Confessions," they say, " four things are to be eschewed as vain ; unbelief, superstition, indifferentism and politics or state-craft. *Unbelief* has no hope, and where there is no hope there can be no Church. *Superstition* is darkness, and only the light that shineth into the darkness can give us a Church. *Indifferentism* is not, as so many affect to think, the strength of man, the free scientific man ; it is spiritual debility and weakness ; and only spirit and life can create a Church. *State-craft* belongs to another sphere wholly different from that of the Church, and when it seeks to use religion for its own ends, religion being itself the highest end of man, it is a crime against religion ; no political diplomacy or chess-play in this form, therefore, can ever advance that well-being of mankind which is comprehended in the union of the Christian Confessions."

Such union, we are told, cannot consist in *uniformity*. National peculiarities, as they appear in different divisions of the Church, have their right, and are not to be suppressed. Hence unity cannot proceed from any single Confession imposing its will on others ; it is possible only through the coming together of all. *Freedom* thus is the law here ; not compulsion ; not subjugation in any way. The union must be *historical* ; based, as Dr. Döllinger says, on the Bible and the old ecumenical creeds ; yet not so as to ignore the onward flow of the true Christian life in later times. Experience has shown, that as no true church union can come from statesmen and politicians, so neither can it come from ecclesiastics in their official character. Where hierarchies or ministries look upon themselves as the Church, separately from the body of the people, they are never free from the snare of ambition ; and their official negotiations for unity, accordingly, are sure to run into an effort on each side to lord it in some way over the other. The union of the Confessions must come in the end from the hearts of God's

believing children, brought to feel their common relationship in the family of God, and so refusing to remain any longer apart. The Old Catholics consider this to be the soul of their own movement, which is thus something wholly new in Church history. "Not in fifteen centuries, not since the beginning of the great divisions of Christendom, has there been anything like it in this, that not the rulers of the Church but the people should rise and say: We ask and demand the return of unity; there is awakening in us a longing for it, which we know to be from the motion of the Divine Spirit now abroad in the Church at large, and this motion we follow by trying to put ourselves at once in a position for the realization of what we desire."

True Church union, it is here assumed, must be catholic in its end, not partial or denominational, and can only come therefore from a catholic mind and purpose in the beginning—a spirit that seeks the reintegration of the divided Church in its *wholeness*, and not any alliance simply of kindred fractions of the Church, which may only serve after all to strengthen the main walls of division. Yet this is not so taken as to exclude the separate organization of collective national Churches. On the contrary, these are essential to the conception of Catholic unity; for nations are original and necessary diversifications of our general human life, resting on the basis of nature; and in any ultimate completeness of humanity (the true idea of the Holy Church Catholic—the Body of Christ), they must be, not abolished, but upheld and conserved as necessary component parts of this life. Such being the case it would seem indeed to follow that the cause of Christian union, as things now are, to be at all effectual, must aim first of all in any case at a national Church wholeness or catholicity, as the only way of reaching catholicity at last in its full ecumenical form. The Old Catholic movement accordingly, proceeds on this principle. While looking to a restitution of Christian unity in the world at large as its ultimate object, its immediate object is the restitution of unity at home, in the Christianity of Germany. Having made herself free from the bondage of the Papal system, the Catholic Church of Germany is to clear

herself at the same time of the old disorders and abuses that have caused division heretofore, and so with the olive branch of peace in her hand say to the Protestant Church of Germany: Let our strife cease, and let us become one fold again under the one Shepherd Jesus Christ.

This is the idea that floats before the mind of Döllinger, and it made itself felt very sensibly in the Congress at Cologne. The English Bishops there showed at first some disposition to force into view their rather narrow theory of Anglicanism, as a model to be admired and followed in the proceedings of the body. But they were soon given kindly to understand, that the Old Catholics of Germany did not mean to become at once either Anglican or Oriental Episcopalian, and that they had no thought especially of looking upon German Protestantism around them in the Pharisaic style too often met with among the would be "Old Catholics" of England; and which, let us add, we find assumed at times with an air by the Episcopalian prudery of some also in this country. In the ideal resurrection Church of Germany, the vast spiritual wealth of the German Reformation is to be fully acknowledged and brought into use.

Such, we say, is the ideal of Döllinger and his friends. What may come of it practically hereafter, we presume not to forecast or predict. Neither do we pretend to criticise it here even as a theory or idea. Our business is to describe simply rather than review. It is not hard to see, however, that if the divisions of the Church in Germany could be healed in the way here proposed, and the now sundered Confessions were again reintegrated into a common grand National Church, in which the Old Catholic faith, redeemed from the long nightmare of the Papacy, should appear happily joined with what is right and good in Protestantism, it would go farther toward a resolution of the great question of the age than any other movement yet attempted or proposed for the purpose. Such a result reached in Germany would be like life from the dead, not only for that nation, but for the nations of Europe in general, and so in a very short time for the universal Christian world. It would be in this respect of infinitely more account than any

Pan-Episcopalian, Pan-Presbyterian, Pan-Methodist, Pan-Lutheran or Pan-Reformed mustering of ecclesiastical forces under their several distinguishing banners, without regard to nationality; and of infinitely more account also, of course, than all mere outside leagues or alliances, that have no higher idea of Christian union than that of a pacification of sects; coming to a general mutual hand-shaking, and agreeing to bear with one another kindly in their respective shibboleths and distinctions.

Looking at the Old Catholic movement in this way, we are not surprised to hear that it is in fact making itself felt already as a power of religious awakening outside of itself, beyond what might seem to be as yet the measure of its outward importance. "It must tell," says Bishop Strossmayer, "on the future religious life of Germany." The distinguished French theologian E. de Pressensè, speaking of the Cologne Congress says: "This convention will assuredly be remembered in Germany. Never since the Reformation were more weighty words spoken. Whatever may be thought of them, they form a page in history, and possibly *the preface to a large book.*" A prominent representative of the Protestant mediational school in Germany writes: "The days of Cologne are over! The power of the Highest wrought visibly in that Catholic conciliabulum. The perplexities of the older Church history are struck dumb before the dower of a new movement in the life of the Church. Old Catholicism, as a religious power, has made a step forward. And this without suffering itself to be drawn by the sapient state worshipers of our time into the attitude of a political party." Dr. Bluntschli, Privy Counsellor and Professor of Heidelberg, a no less prominent representative of the free-thinking wing of German Protestantism, declares: "What he had witnessed in the Cologne Congress convinced him, that there was no ground for apprehending that the Old Catholic Movement would lose itself in the sand; and that the movement has before it a great future." Still another leading Protestant voice says, with reference to the reunion question: "The difficulties of the case have not been overlooked; but the greatest thing by far is that a hand is actually put to the

work. The Old Catholics have thereby shown themselves to be in the deepest conceivable sense German patriots and friends of the national peace. The common sympathy of the two Protestant Confessions with the movement, is working back also on their own relation to each other with salutary effect. Steady attention to what is here going on, and growing serious occupation with the problems and interests of Old Catholicism, have already begun to exert visibly an inward reconciling and uniting influence on the hostile parties of the Evangelical Church." One more testimony and we have done; a word this time from Italy, spoken by one of her best scholars, R. Bonghi, Professor in Rome. Called by his studies and position, he informs us, to observe closely the revelations that are taking place in the profound heaving and working of modern society, he has been led, in view of what official Romanism was on one side and the perpetual self-dissolving sect life of Protestantism on the other, to look upon the Old Catholic initiative as the last and only promise of help for the case. "If the reform of Catholicism succeeds not with you," he says, addressing the leaders of the movement, "if it succeeds not with you to restore a divinely accredited religious authority, free from all exaggeration, it will be in my judgment the greatest proof to show, that *Europe is on the eve of a religious overturning*, the end of which we can as little foresee as its mode of coming to pass."

ART. VI—DOES A DIVINE CURSE REST UPON THE WORLD?

This question admits of an easy answer to the believer in divine revelation. What we are there told is plain and unequivocal, and admits of but one interpretation. “Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” The New Testament also takes up the sad refrain, when it says: “For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.”

And yet, although this is so plain that the Christian must believe it, it certainly cannot weaken our faith if we should find by an examination of nature, that the voice of the one agrees with the voice of the other. We propose to listen to this voice of nature in order to know whether it does not tell fundamentally the same story as the voice of revelation. We wish to examine the dicta of natural science, in order to see that the Scripture story of the curse is really true.

But, in order to do this, we will accept as true and indisputable, the conclusion which science has arrived at with regard to the creation, viz.: that it was not accomplished in six ordinary days of twenty-four hours, but that it progressed through long and indeterminable periods. Passing by the nicer points

involved in this question, let us simply regard the days spoken of in the Scriptural story of the creation, as *days of God*. The Scriptures themselves seem to us to give sufficient indications of such days. "A thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch of the night." "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

According to the Mosaic account of the Genesis, this latter was accomplished according to a law of progress—a lower stage of creation being always followed by a higher stage; in such a way, also, that the lower stage always looked forward to a higher one, of which it was always the platform. The first act was the creation of matter. We may suppose that at this stage, up to the time when the waters were gathered together and the dry land had appeared, the laws of mechanics and of chemical attraction and repulsion were in the hand of God the main forces of creation. When the dry land had appeared, the waters had been gathered together, and the firmament had been established, a great step forward had been made. Although the earth was yet desolate and barren, a desert waste, nevertheless, order had taken the place of the former chaos, and a point of departure had been gained for a new and higher order of creation, that of vegetation. This was in proper order followed by the creation of marine animals, land animals, and, finally, as the end and highest aim of all, the creation of man.

Such is the record of revelation. The record of geology is essentially the same. If the nebular hypothesis is true, then mechanical and chemical laws must at first have been the order of the day. After these had accomplished their object, and the earth had assumed the form of continents and oceans, the first geological age, just as in the Scriptures, is the Azoic. During this age no traces of life, either vegetable or animal, are found.

Next in order come plants. But as there is a constant onward progress in creation as a whole, so the same is very nota-

ble in every department of it. For plants first appear, not in their present perfection and beauty, but in the simple form of Algae, or seaweeds. This order continues through all that geological age, which scientists have called the Silurian, and forward to the Hamilton period of the Devonian age. During the period named, evidences of land plants appear, and even of trees of the lower botanical orders. During the Carboniferous age, vegetation becomes very exuberant; but even here it continues to be of the lower orders, of ferns and kindred plants. After this, in the progress of the creative ages, come our present forest trees, and then fruit trees. But what seems to us very significant, is the fact that nowhere in the preadamite earth are there found any traces of fossil cereals, the tame plants, the proper food of man. These are found only where man has dwelt, as in the Swiss lake dwellings and in the pyramids of Egypt. May we not legitimately conclude from this, that they were the last vegetable creations of God? Intended for man, they made their appearance cotemporaneously with man.

If now we turn to animals, we find creation proceeding according to the same law of progress. During the Silurian age, fossils of only the lowest orders of animals are found, such as Molluscs, Articulates, and Radiates, animals like oysters, worms and crabs. During the following, or Devonian age, the first instance of the highest type of animal creation is met with in the form of fishes. Next in the order of time are found huge reptiles, the first of terrestrial animals, then mammals of colossal dimensions, and, finally, man himself. And what is here again remarkable, is the fact that those animals which were especially intended for the use of man, to be his companions and assistants, and to afford him food and clothing, are met with only in the age preceding the creation of man. Wild animals were being extirpated, and the so-called domestic animals were beginning to take their place.

From the scant traces which we have given, it will appear that creation proceeded according to a certain law, and in a fixed direction. The law was progress, the direction of this progress was *from the wild to the tame*. This seems to us to be

a clear dictum of the geological record. During all the pre-adamite ages we find extinctions and creations; every extinction was followed by a creation, both vegetable and animal, which was higher and better than the preceding. May we not conclude from this that if some great disturbing element had not entered the world, reversing this law and its direction, an age would have come when nothing wild, nothing but what would have been of use to the physical, aesthetic, and moral nature of man, would have continued to exist? We do not mean to say that with the appearance of man everything that is wild had become extinct; we only mean that this was the direction of the law which governed the pre-adamite world, and that a time would have come in the history of the world, when every thing wild and of no use to man would have become extinct.

In what now did this curse, pronounced by God upon the world, consist? We suppose that it was, in the first place, a change or reversal in the plan of God. If we have rightly apprehended the law and direction of God in creation, it is no far-fetched hypothesis that the whole earth should at one time be a paradise, and that, at the creation of man, the earth was actually approaching this condition. The paradise which God created for the abode of man was limited to a certain area, the boundaries of which are distinctly given in the second chapter of Genesis. But it was the intention of God in the creation of man, that the latter should occupy the whole earth; for "God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." But if it was right and proper that a sinless Adam should dwell in a paradise, it is just as right and proper that a sinless Adamite race should also dwell there. The time would, therefore, necessarily come, when the limited area of the primitive paradise would require enlargement in order to accommodate the wants of the ever-increasing race. And, following this out to its last consequences, ought not the whole earth at last to be a paradise?

And this is no mere groundless speculation. We think that even natural science cannot deny the possibility of it. For climatic conditions, and, with them, the flora and fauna of the earth, and consequently, also, the adaptedness of the earth to be a pleasant abode for man, in fact, a paradise, depend very much upon its physical geography, upon the conformations of oceans, continents, and islands. It is known that the climatic conditions of the earth have often changed from these very causes. Suppose, now, that our arctic continents, those breeders of ice and winter storms, should sink beneath the ocean, a supposition which during the physical history of the earth seems to have been an accomplished fact more than once, what a wonderful change this would produce upon present climatic conditions. And suppose, further, that our continents were broken up into islands, giving room to the warm waters of the ocean to circulate freely, as the blood circulates in the human body and warms every part of it, can we not readily imagine that, wherever upon this earth there was solid land, there there would have been a paradise?

We suppose, in the second place, that this curse implies a retrograde movement to an antecedent stage of creation, a falling back upon a lower plane of the physical condition of the earth. Such was undoubtedly the effect of sin upon the physical and moral constitution of man. In a physical point of view, man was created mortal; or, let us say, he occupied a neutral position between death and immortality. The object of the trial in the Garden of Eden was to bring Adam out of this neutral position; to choose for himself either death or immortality. He chose the former. The possibility of dying, in which he was created, was given up in favor of the necessity of dying. The same was the case with Adam as a moral being. He was created innocent; that is, free from sin, but also without positive, acquired holiness. Another object of the trial in Eden was to give unto Adam the opportunity to choose freely between the two. He chose sin. From the possibility of sinning he passed over unto the necessity of sinning. From either point of view, the decision of Adam in Paradise was a

retrograde, a fall to a lower position. We accordingly find, too, that his outward position in the world underwent a change corresponding with his inward condition. Before the fall it is said of Adam : " And the Lord God took the man and put him into the *garden* of Eden, to dress it and to keep it." After the fall it is said : " But Cain was a *tiller of the ground*." The difference seems to us significant. Paradise was nature perfected and tamed; nature rescued from its extremes, and quieted down to its proper equilibrium; a picture and prophecy of that which, as the times and the necessities of the race demanded, the entire earth would have become. From horticulture man turned back to agriculture.

We suppose that this retrograde affected the climate of our planet, throwing it out of equilibrium which it had partly already gained, and to which the whole was approaching. It is certainly a remarkable fact that the earth in the course of its history had been subject to extremes of climate holding sway over entire ages. We find that first there was an age of excessive heat extending over the entire planet, as appears from the fact that fossil plants and animals are found in high northern latitudes, which at present are found only in tropical climates. This universal tropical climate passed away and was succeeded by an age of ice, which covered nearly the half of both the northern and southern hemisphere. Extremes ruled the earth for ages, and from one extreme it passed into the other. But in the course of ages both extremes were overcome, and a moderate and agreeable climate seems to have extended far towards our present arctic regions. This certainly appears from the fact that the mammoth and elephant, animals which at present are limited to warm southern climates, then roamed over the high northern latitudes of both the Eastern and Western continents. For even if these animals possessed a woolly covering, apparently to protect them against cold, yet if the regions over which they roamed were arctic as they now are they could not at any time of the year have found sufficient herbage to afford them sustenance. This suggests to us the same conclusion at which we have already arrived from the pre-adamite

history of animals and plants. The prevailing character of the pre-adamite plants and animals was wildness. With the appearance of man those plants and animals appear, which were intended for his use and sustenance. So also the pre-adamite climate of the earth partook of the same character of wildness. It was excessive and extreme. An æon of cosmical summer, so excessive as to produce an excess of exuberant vegetation, was succeeded by an æon of cosmical winter, destructive of nearly all the life of the earth, both animal and vegetable. Both extremes passed away, and the climate was being tamed down to a moderate equilibrium. If the constitution of our globe embraces the condition of a universal summer extending through ages, and a universal winter extending through like ages, may it not also embrace the conditions of a universal medium climate; a climate best adapted to man, and to those animals and plants which are most adapted to his wants? And if the extremes of both heat and cold had actually passed away, and moderate climatic conditions were beginning to exist with the appearance of man; is it not probable that this last process of moderating and taming down would have continued, until the whole earth had become an abode calculated to educate man to his highest type, and to afford to him everywhere the highest enjoyment? Now the fact is, that present climatic conditions are not what they were in the age preceding the appearance of man upon the earth. The moderating process seems stopped; the genial medium has not been reached. The climate of the earth moves annually between extremes. Hence the earth is again better adapted to a wild vegetation and to wild animals. Weeds grow in exuberance, and our tame plants grow only when man bestows upon their cultivation the utmost skill and care. The earth does produce thorns and thistles more readily than grapes and figs; weeds more readily than corn and wheat. And if man would eat his daily bread, he must do so in the sweat of his face, as the product of hard labor and toil.

ART. VII.—THE TENDENCY TO INDIVIDUALISM IN THE GERMAN CHURCHES IN AMERICA.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF.

THE individual has intelligence and will, and must therefore have some degree of freedom in the exercise of his personal powers. Without such freedom there can be no personal responsibility, and, accordingly, no real manhood. Neither divine nor human law may ignore this fact, and turn man into a mere machine. It is the unalterable norm of moral order that individuality comes to its proper self-consciousness and personal dignity, in the way of unconstrained rational activity, a law which the new creation in Christ through the gospel recognizes, and towards the solution of which it is constantly tending. Indeed, there is nothing so grand and cheering in all history besides, as this process of evangelic individuation as it lies before us in the colossal movements of the Christian era.

Christianity has proven to be the most effectual destroyer of castes the world ever saw. Its ruling apostolic genius is in no sympathy with artificial barriers of any kind, standing in the way of the emancipation and unification of all classes and conditions of men. It places all on the same level before God in the economy of grace, and unites them into a brotherhood in which all distinctions prejudicial to manhood must give way. St. Paul says that in this communion there can be neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free, thus indicating the equality of all in the moral scheme of personality, giving to the world a new key to the laws of social and political economy, and opening the gates wide for the ushering in of an era of universal redemption, freedom and peace. We need not wonder that this trumpet-blast of apostolic good news met with a warm response from the popular heart all along the highway of Christian civilization, and that it gave rise to frequent antag-

onisms between the organized powers of society on the one hand, and the aspirations of individualism on the other. These struggles, or conflicts, were simply the conditions that lay directly in the life of the process to which they belonged, and hence in the very nature of things it could not be otherwise. Society, as the gospel found it, had no proper conception of the rights and dignity of the individual, and neither had the individual a true sense of his own responsibility and destiny, and of course the lofty ideal of a full-grown Christian community could only be gradually realized. But that this high standard has been approached by degrees, and that many of the beneficent results of the movement are now firmly imbedded in the laws and manners of modern society, is a fact too well known to require argument. The process has reached its present status in such a way as to leave the race in a much better state generally than it was when it began. The benefit is reaped by both society, in its universal capacity, and the individual personally taken. This is the secret that lies at the bottom of the momentum of our civilization, which, in the course of its progress, cannot be long resisted by any of the decaying systems of Pagan life.

Now it is not to be expected that so radical and far-reaching a revolution as this, involving such momentous issues, looking towards changes so intimately interwoven with the manifold interests of men and orders of society, and having such world-historical depth and significance, could be passed through without touching the tenderest chords of personal aspirations, thus giving rise to an order of intense individualism in the bosom of Christian nations. And if we consider that this vitalizing agency is present in history for ages, and that it is gathering strength as it is growing and spreading in the world, we may easily understand why there should be so broad and deep a chasm between the civilization, in the bosom of which Herod slew the young children of Bethlehem of Judea, without answering for his cruelty, and that of our own day and generation, in the codes and judicial proceedings of which so much care is taken that even the worst criminals receive the benefit

of an impartial trial. This wide difference between the customs of antiquity and our modern humane modes of law and custom lies in the source from which it sprang, and in the life that gives it character and aim. Modern individualism, or individuation, would hardly differ from that of the ancients in principle, habit and spirit, had it not received its inspiration in the schools of a more humane humanity than that of the classics, and had it not been ruled in all the stages of its growth by a more magnanimous tribunal than that of the forum. The presence of the kingdom of Christ in the world as the central power of history has brought about these wonderful miracles of change in the moral and social order of the nations, and therefore to understand the individualism of our civilization in its distinction from the economy of all other orders of life, ancient or modern, requires a philosophical sense of a positively Christian kind—a personality apprehended and borne along by the objective historic current, in the order of which the whole grand mystery of our civilization was begotten and brought forth.

But we must look now for some specimens by which the individualistic peculiarities of our times may be set forth, and the normal and beneficial, or abnormal and injurious, workings of the same may be demonstrated.

Individualism is not just the same among all people, even under the full power of the same order of life. Anglo-American individuality differs widely from that common to the Teutonic stock, although both stand in the bosom of the same nationality, and have a common destiny. Constitutionally they have much alike, belonging both to the Anglo-Saxon race, yet there are evidently very broad and radical differences between them. Americans of Anglican extraction are moving in the full tide of popular freedom and activity. In theory they often hold views which, followed out logically, would strike at the root of all authority standing over and above the individual, and those not familiar with their mode of reasoning by practical experience, would be liable to regard them as a body of fanatical destructives little better than the Jacobins and Red Republicans of French revolutionary memory. No greater mis-

take could, however, be made, generally speaking, in forming a judgment of the character and opinions of any people. Along with their extreme love of personal freedom, they possess a remarkable talent for organizing and co-operating in the enforcement of great and liberal measures, and a rigid practical conservatism by which they generally manage to maintain the supremacy of the laws and the stability of popular traditions, together with an apparently reckless disregard for fixed, routine, or stiff orthodox mannerism. Any one with his eyes but half open, may see this every day. By this ready adaptation to circumstances they atone for many of the theoretical heresies which characterize their modes of thinking. In Church government and theology, for instance, their views are often of the most bald spiritualistic and unhistorical kind; but when they come to take hold of the practical concerns of religion and the Church, they generally succeed to a wonderful degree in securing the co-operation of the masses, setting in motion thus an engineery of complicated ecclesiastical and beneficent propaganda not less effective, in its disciplinary movements, than many high-toned churchly organizations, or orders, of the same kind. Into these measures they frequently enter with an alacrity that cannot but be highly refreshing to all who have a taste for genuine business energy and zeal, and that especially in the cause of benevolent and religious enterprise. It is this that has given them the power to found and endow so many institutions of learning, to raise up such magnificent monuments of public beneficence on a most munificent scale, and to carry forward schemes of missionary enterprise broad and comprehensive in character and aim, all by the powerful logic of generous co-operation. No blind or stupid fear of the possible abuse of organized effort, keeps them from banding together for the accomplishment of great ends. They are generally shrewd and intelligent enough to see that freedom of opinion is committing a grand folly when it refuses to join broad but liberal combinations, regardless of the necessary check thus laid on the selfish movings of individual caprice:

It is true, much of this Anglo-American munificence and

success comes in large contributions, from the hands of wealthy individuals. Many of their literary endowments and benevolent institutions have been founded in this way, and yet it is well known that, in these cases of individual liberality, the masses are often asked to join; and they have frequently done so in a measure corresponding with the princely designs of the original movers. This is what has given Anglo-American life such aggressive force and prominence in all the public affairs of this nation. As matters now stand they have the advantage over all other nationalities here represented, but the time was when this was not so much the case, when other foreign elements were more on an equality with that of English origin and habits. But we have now a national character distinctly formed and drawn, and there is no longer any question as to what language shall be the vernacular of this great Republic. These things are strongly in favor of the English churches, and powerfully against those of other tongues. It has been so in the past, but it is becoming still more so every day; for the English language is rapidly sweeping every thing in its course, and no foreign tongue can maintain itself long except by immigration. In view of this fact it is but wisdom and good sense to submit cheerfully to the demands of the situation by cultivating and adopting the language and manners of the country, or make up one's mind to be absorbed piecemeal by the rapidly growing Anglo-American life around us.

And just here we may turn an eye to some of the peculiarities of Teutonic individualism, not only that we may look back to the past and know what has happened there, but rather that we may learn from the past how we may act wisely in the future.

That we who have sprung from the great Teutonic stock, whether we speak the language of Germania or not, are not as practical as our English neighbors, and that therefore we have not the same capacity for self-government, we take to be a self-evident fact that needs not to be repeated. This undoubtedly is our misfortune under the circumstances, although we may stoutly maintain that it does not amount to a reproach, since it

is a constitutional failing over which nationalities have as little absolute control as individuals. However, if an honest confession is good for the soul, a little unprejudiced and intelligent examination into the short-comings of our native constitutional habit, may also leave a blessing in its track and bring us back to our task stronger and wiser, and better qualified, to act thereafter in accordance with the issues committed to our care.

Nothing have the German churches in this country so much reason to regret bitterly and profoundly, as their failure to take permanent possession of the commercial centres at an early day. They had an early foothold in many of them, but they let them slide from their grasp. This was not because they might not have held them, by the exercise of proper forethought and care; but rather because they did not comprehend the signs of the times, and did not satisfy the reasonable, the urgent, the irresistible demands of the rising wants of the American people. The young membership grew English, in spite of every obstacle or protest, no provision was made for them in the language they preferred, and hence they withdrew, either single file or in organized bodies, and passed into other connections. This process has been going on for generations, so that large numbers of the most intelligent and spirited members have gone away, and once flourishing churches stand almost forsaken or have disappeared altogether, except where foreign immigration has come to the rescue. Neither has this alienation or loss of material yet come to a close, but it is still going on precisely for the same reasons as before. This is the result of our Teutonic individualism, at least in a large measure, which has not been cured as yet entirely of its proverbial native helplessness. If the necessary foresight and capacity for prompt measures of relief were ever fully at its command, as we find them in the life and history of other ecclesiastical communions, we rather think this continual outflow of material from the German churches would long since have been checked or prevented, and we would stand foremost in many places where we have scarcely a name.

In our educational affairs we have also been sadly afflicted

with a characteristic want of a practical matter-of-fact judgment, especially in the case of a higher culture. Some of our institutions of learning have an existence, dating back half or three quarters of a century. Even endowments of some kind were not altogether wanting at that early period, but, as far as the Reformed Church is concerned at least, they amounted to but little as sources for the general culture of our people, until the present generation began to turn them to some practical account. For this reason we failed to raise up a ministry competent to meet the growing wants of the more advanced classes, and hence we were brought to ecclesiastical grief especially in the commercial centres, and suffered immensely in the way of social caste and influence. All this did not happen because we might not have commanded the means to prevent it, but simply because as a body we had neither the will nor the practical capacity to rise up to the demands of the emergency. Had we consolidated our resources in an intelligent way, after the matter-of-fact style of the Anglo-American churches, we might long ago have maintained very respectable literary and theological institutions, and now we might proudly point to Anglo-German establishments of the kind which would rank among the broadest foundations of the country. What was the cause of all this?

It was not the want of intellectual calibre surely; for when it comes to the question of brains, the Germanic race may come in boldly for a comparative measurement of craniums.

And not only that, but they may point to their productiveness in many of the higher walks of intellectual culture—to their achievements in theology, philosophy, philology, and the fine arts, for instance, and justly claim that in the kind Providence of God they have been endowed with powers not inferior to those of the most gifted nationalities the world ever saw. But all this does not go to show now, that, with all their brains and noble qualities, they have not been and are not still seriously unequal to some of the practical issues of American history. Allowance must be made for circumstances and other considerations that cannot be mentioned here; but after all is

said and done we will be forced back to the conclusion that Anglo-German culture, at the hands of the Germans in America, lags badly behind, simply because the Germans themselves, on account of their native individualistic helplessness, have not the practical energy to cope with the American mind in the broad educational movements of the day, at least as far as the founding of well-endowed centres of literary culture is concerned. When it comes to ideas and modes of thought, they stand not only on an equality with Anglo-Americans, but in some respects above them, and their institutions, though comparatively small, are the sources of the highest order of intellectual and moral culture, better suited to the wants of our people than the more empirical training of the reigning Anglo-American type. Ideas and modes of thought will however no more enable them to conquer the world extensively in the way of missionary growth and church extension, than similar gifts and powers saved the intellectual sons of Hellas from conquest and subjugation by the more practical and materialistic nationalities of the Latin race.

Now of course when we have pointed out the native weakness of the Teutonic character in the settlement of the question of language and the establishment of literary institutions, suited to the American situation, we have given the key to all correlative questions belonging to their history. All schemes for missionary and benevolent enterprise come in for settlement in the same way, and their want of satisfactory success must be accounted for on much the same principle. We therefore need not dwell on any facts of that kind with a view further to demonstrate the constitutional idiosyncrasies of the Germanic stock, as differing from other leading nationalities. But there is one more feature of our subject to which we must make special reference, in order that we may bring out fully the justice of the train of thought we have been pursuing in this communication, and thus open the way for some practical conclusions to be drawn from it—we have reference to the undue fear of properly constituted authority in benevolent and church matters, which has entered so largely into our history, and which has been a barrier to our success at every turn.

We have frequently called attention to the want of Teutonic capacity for forming broad combinations for practical ends, and it is necessary here to say that, in this country where all measures of the kind must be of a voluntary character, this weakness was aided particularly in its pernicious tendencies by an exaggerated idea of personal freedom. It is a notorious fact that Teutonic individuality has been the prolific source of many a national disaster, simply because it ignored the higher claims of national unity. And if we look now into the history of the German Churches of America, it requires but little investigation to see that the want of organization, of unity, of a catholic co-operative denominational spirit, perhaps in the case of all of them, but especially with reference to the Reformed Church, was the main, the cardinal difficulty standing in the way of our progress, and doing incalculable injury to our standing and influence as an ecclesiastical power in the land. Not that others were not inclined in the same extreme way, but they were more successful in overcoming the mischief that sprang from this tendency. The sainted Schlatter made an attempt to effect a solid organization of our scattered Churches here, but he encountered this blind spirit of independency or exaggerated love of personal freedom, and he was driven into retirement before his noble work was accomplished. Subsequent attempts met with the same opposition, and now, only after ages of severe struggle, have we reached a tolerably compact order of Presbyterian government. Had we been as practical as the Puritans of New England, all our false notions of freedom on the one hand and of tyranny on the other, would not have done us so much harm; but while they joined hands in a free but combined way to carry forward liberal measures, we stood pensive and alone in the bleak blue glory of our individualistic helplessness.

These are facts that will not very likely prove agreeable to our national vanity, and if it were possible to blot them from the records of our past experience, we should do so most cheerfully and readily. But they stand like grim and hoary sentinels all along the highway of our American history, and they

will not fail to bring us to a halt as soon as we undertake to pass them by without doing due honor to their historic position and significance. We owe it therefore to ourselves and to the generations yet to come, to look these facts fully in the face and to make such account of them as the present and the future success of the Reformed faith, and the honor of the German name, may require. No one inspired with the true genius of our Republican liberties, would advocate any abridgement of popular rights, either in Church or State, nor could this be done without flying in the face of the universal tendency of the age. But it is also true that that order of individualism, which is tending to disruption, disunion and consequent weakness and injury to all the higher interests of the Church and the commonwealth, is no longer sustained at the bar of intelligent popular opinion. What the people now want is, liberal but powerful governments, able to guarantee safety of person and property, and to secure all the advantages of a broadly developed Christian civilization. And as these are the demands of modern political economy, so the same comprehensive genius must govern the evangelical or churchly and beneficent movements of the age. If we are wise, therefore, we will waste no time in finding fault with the unpleasant facts of our past history, but we will be careful to pursue a more rational course in the future, and join hands for the execution of liberal schemes.

Thus far we have had an eye mainly to the mistakes and losses of the past, and it is now time that we should turn our faces more particularly towards the future, and in the shadow of coming events, endeavor to inaugurate a policy more in keeping with the signs of the times than the habits of former days.

After an experience of more than a century we have at last come, as we remarked before, to a tolerably compact order of Presbyterial government in the Reformed Church. In this respect we are in advance of the Lutheran Church, which is more akin to Congregationalism in its theory of church government, than the organic law we recognize and maintain. But the genius of an organic formal unity has not yet gained

such entire sway over our denominational mind and energies, as to lift us fully out of the misery of our Germanic individualistic disorder. The old German Adam seems to be still living, with his characteristic want of ability to comprehend the American situation and to act promptly with an eye to measures of permanent success. This chronic evil is still in greater force in some sections than in others, but the whole body is weakened by its disorganizing tendencies. Indeed it looks just at this time as if there was to be a wholesale revival of our chaotic proclivities. It would be rash, and hence unwise to say, that some of the deliverances of the late General Synod must necessarily lead to this bad result; yet we may be permitted to suggest that they seem to look emphatically in that direction. If, by this time, we are become sufficiently wide-a-wake and cohesive to master our inveterate constitutional aptness for running into individualistic confusion and to keep our theoretic and other differences within rational bounds, no evil will come from the logic of late events. But should passions and prejudices like those of by-gone days be allowed to rule our cause, we will not pass through the wilderness of our coming denominational career without leaving wrecks and ruins behind, such as we have been so often forced to behold amid the sad reminiscences of past generations. And should we fail now to meet the emergency, it would simply be one more proof that we belong to a national stock that is constitutionally deficient in some of the necessary qualifications for popular self-government, and that the disasters with which we so often meet are the result, at least in a great measure, of a want of far-sighted adaptation to circumstances.

These may be apparently sweeping conclusions, and we have not drawn them without a lively sense of the gravity of the situation. By passing this judgment we feel that we are one of the prisoners at the bar, and that sentence falls upon us no less than upon others of the same kith and kin; but for better reasons than this do we regard it as a sacred duty, on the one hand, to pass our criticism squarely and fairly, and on the other, to warn frankly against the folly of a wholesale condem-

nation. If we have failed in some things for reasons given, we have done nobly also in other things, and the rising character of this nation will owe some of its noblest traits to the constitutional make of the stock to which we belong. If in practical enterprise we have been outrun, we may at least claim the high honor of giving depth and stability to American culture and of aiding our young nationality in grappling with the deeper issues of our intellectual and religious life. What we are particularly concerned about now, however, is to get into the channel of greater practical activity and success, which is precisely the matter in which we have been wanting. Our seminaries and colleges are not sufficiently endowed, and we need one or more central institutions on a broad scale to give us status and strength equal to our demands, and the machinery of our benevolent operations needs to be enlarged tenfold. It is exceedingly unfortunate, therefore, that there should be still a seeming incapacity for rising to a level with this emergency, by taking measures at once, as a body, through which our interests as a denomination might be firmly secured. If such measures will not prevail it will neither be for the lack of means or resources, nor for that of genuine Christian piety; but the real cause must be sought for in that Germanic want of unity, which has brought many sad calamities upon the noble race which has been so long and so largely afflicted with it.

But here let us say that there are facts at hand which show that we have some capacity at least for generous measures of popular enterprise. The larger ecclesiastical bodies, with all their native weakness and want of compact organic unity in a truly popular or American sense, have made steady progress in all the elements of a vigorous, orderly, intelligent and well-organized church activity, and some of the smaller bodies, having a more centralized form of government, or being in other respects more favorably situated for generous culture, have displayed a degree of missionary activity, of practical aggressive energy, and even of social refinement, not surpassed by any of the Anglo-American communities in the land. And all this goes to prove certainly that, if only the proper condi-

tions are allowed to rule, we may compare favorably with others on the practical arena of American benevolent and religious progress. But this very fact, it seems to us, is also conclusive evidence that the present crisis demands something better at our hands than the introduction of measures, in any way calculated to hinder or prevent a closer and more efficient organization of our popular resources. Consolidation and combination on a broad scale is what the issues of the times require, and should we be weak and blind enough to let our golden opportunity once more slip from beyond our grasp, then surely should we not be offended if some one would take us severely to task for being most lamentably slow in learning the manners of true Americans. Others know how to enjoy their individual freedom in connection with the most comprehensive and solid organization, and how to enter into voluntary combinations for general ends without being everlastingly defeated in their aims by petty local and partisan differences, and, if we cannot learn to do the same thing in a reasonable degree, we should not hesitate to acknowledge that Germanic individualism is our misfortune and that the issues of American Christianity and civilization must ultimately fall to the care of Anglo-American Churches.

The difficulty of language is another matter, that claims attention in this connection. We have seen how it has hindered our progress in the past, and we may rest assured that it will do the same thing in the future if a more enlightened spirit or judgment will not come to rule in the case. We have heard many complaints about the neglect of the German and the wrongs done to it, and these complaints were likely not without just cause; but it would be a very easy matter to show that, if wrong was done, it was not all on one side. No one at all familiar with the facts can fail to know that very much of our best and most promising material has been driven from our communion by a narrow and arbitrary adherence to the mother tongue, in many cases where the progressive demands of American life made a change of language both necessary and wise. Now, as far as our native born German membership are

concerned, this trouble is no longer of so serious a character—they begin to fall in readily with the current of the times and the rising generation will carry the language with them to their graves. Our foreign-German membership however, as a body, can hardly be expected to look at this matter at once with a truly American eye, and to manage it with such a degree of practical judgment as the surrounding circumstances require. Yet this much ought to be clearly understood by all, that our American churches of German origin and character can have no permanent existence here except in the language of the country, and that in proportion as this is ignored a blow is struck at the very existence of the faith we wish to preserve. If it is the duty of the English portion of our members to aid the Germans in missions and otherwise—a duty that should be wisely and cheerfully discharged—it is also the duty of the Germans to join heartily in the promotion of English enterprises, with a view not only to make provision for those who do not understand the German, but to prepare congenial homes for their own rapidly English growing children. This is accordingly, at once, a profound scientific problem and a question of intense practical significance, worthy to be discussed and mastered by all in the interest of our German Christianity. And again would we say, if it should appear in the course of time that we have not been able to settle or solve the problem in a rational way, it will be another proof that our Germanic individualism was too strong for the success of the faith of our fathers; and if such should be the result of our want of practical forecast, what would all our professed devotion to Reformed orthodoxy amount to?

We have said that we need combined effort, on a large popular scale, in behalf of the various progressive schemes and interests claiming our attention, and a vigorous, intelligent, co-operative, denominational spirit to push forward the measures of a comprehensive Anglo-German enterprise. May we not suggest now, that along with this movement of the people in their united capacity, munificent contributions from wealthy individuals, in the style and manner of Anglo-Americans, would

help the cause of our Germanic progress immensely and give us a commanding position in the most advanced circles of our rising nationality? We have men of large means, although not so many as some others; but if we once become fully conscious of the claims of our Teutonic origin and mission, and begin to feel the warm glow of our distinct national life pulsating strongly in unison with the popular heart of this nation, we trust that noble spirits will not be wanting who, with one grand master-stroke of generous munificence, will place our missionary and benevolent enterprises and our various educational institutions on as broad a basis as those founded by other nationalities. When that day comes all occasion for swan-like notes of woe, in the midst of death-like struggles for national and denominational self-preservation will have an end, and we may with one heart and voice shout the merry songs of genuine festive joy.

Having thus glanced, but briefly, at Anglo-Germano-American individualisms and their results, we trust that we have furnished at least some material for earnest reflection on the questions which the subject involves. Let the reader now take up the subject, study it, and draw such lessons, or conclusions, from it as he may see fit.

ART. VIII.—THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE IN AMERICA.*

“AMERICA is, as yet, merely on the threshold of its theological existence; but the future of Protestantism greatly depends upon the further development of this powerful nation, delivered, as it now is, from the curse of slavery. It is on this account that the maintenance and increase of its acquaintance with German theology and its acquisitions is of incalculable importance. At present the disruption of parties is great, and their opposition often more a matter of caprice or external interest than one likely to result in earnest scientific controversy. But the more a feeling for theological science increases, and with it that power of reasoning in which a unifying power is inherent, because its aim is the universally and absolutely true, the more will many of the existing denominations necessarily disappear, and others enter upon such a process of mutual understanding as will secure a common history of their intellectual and religious life, which, like that of Great Britain, may vie, on equal terms and with fruitful results, with German theology.”—*Dr. Dorner's History of Protestant Theology.*

Dr. Hodge's Theology and Prof. Fisher's History of the Reformation are among the latest American theological works, and they may be taken as an evidence of the independent interest and activity in theological science in this country, and an earnest of what we may expect in this direction. The former of these two works we have already briefly noticed as it was leaving the press. It is now completed, and consists of three large volumes, the first treating of Theology proper, the second of Anthropology, the third of Soteriology and Eschatology.

* **SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.** By Charles Hodge, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Vols. I. II. III., New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson and Sons, 1873.

THE REFORMATION. By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co., 1873.

We refer to it now again as a specimen of the independent activity and research beginning to show themselves in theological science in this country. Dr. Hodge's Theology has been favorably received and noticed both in this country and in England. It is an epitome of old Calvinistic theology, somewhat modified, though to no large extent, by the progress of theological thinking in our own times.

Prof. Fisher's work is a contribution to historical theology, which is at once a credit to its author and to the study of Church history in this country. It is all the more significant that it comes from Puritan New England. That section has not been behindhand, as we well know, in intellectual activity and work. What they did in the early colonial times in the interest of education, in founding colleges, and what they have done in more recent times in liberally endowing their institutions of learning, affords abundant testimony in this respect. New England has been the thinking head for a large portion of this country, and Boston, as we know, claims to be the literary metropolis of the American Republic. New England, too, is distinguished for the theological activity of its earlier times. The senior and junior Edwards, Hopkins, Bellamy, Emmons, Dwight, and Taylor, were divines who made no small stir in the provincial life of New England in their day. But Puritanism was constitutionally narrow and contracted from the beginning. It did not breathe the free air of the Reformation as a whole, but employed its energies in asserting its freedom from English conformity. It was not a part of the original reformation, but a much smaller movement in the secondary stages of that great Awakening.

The Puritan theory of the Church was exceedingly narrow and weak. Of a divine constitution or economy of grace, having a real objective existence in the world, they seemed to have no idea whatever. Their only thought was of the conversion of individuals, and these congregating together, and entering into covenant with God (not *He* with them, after the Scriptural examples) constituted a Church. Each congregation formed an independent Church. There was no thought of an organic

body, in union with which all the parts must stand. There was little comprehension of the sacraments or mysteries of the kingdom of grace. As a consequence of such individualistic or atomistic theory of Christianity, there could be little sense for the meaning of Christian history. Of Christianity as an organic unfolding or process, reaching in living succession and unity from the Apostles down through the ages, they had no conception.

Thirty years ago the puritans of New England regarded the Apostles' Creed as a fossil, or relic, of an age with which the Church of the present has nothing to do. The Bible took the place, for them, of the Apostolic Church, and Primitive Christianity after the apostolic age was in their eyes a barren desert. And yet it is from Prof. Fisher, of New England, that we now have a profound work on the Supernatural in Christianity, and also this History of the Reformation. What, it may be asked, is there strange in all that? The strange thing is the manner in which our author approaches his subject, compared with the New England method of viewing the Church thirty years ago.

After the manner of German writers, Prof. Fisher devotes no less than *eighty pages* of his book to the *preparation* for the Reformation. Let us follow him in his treatment in this introductory chapter: "The Protestant movement," he tells us, "is often looked upon as hardly less preternatural and astonishing than would be the rising of the sun at midnight. But the more it is examined, the less does it wear this marvellous aspect. In truth, never was a historical crisis more elaborately prepared, and this through a train of causes which reach back into the remote past. Nor is it the fact that such events are wholly out of the reach of human foresight; they cast their shadows before; they are the objects of presentiments more or less distinct, sometimes of definite prediction." Then the author gives us different theories which profess to account for the Reformation. While the superstitious attributed it "to a certain uncommon and malignant position of the stars, which scattered the spirit of giddiness and innovation over the world;" others have looked upon it as a squabble of monks. Guizot

considers it "an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order." Others again see in it a transitional era, paving the way for free thinking or unbelief. Over against all these theories, the author regards the Reformation, first of all, as a movement within the domain of religion.

Tracing it to this central current of history, he finds it to possess a negative and a positive character; negative in denying the errors of Rome, and positive in asserting its own principles, the authority of the Scriptures, and justification by faith alone. "It is evident, also, from the foregoing statement, that in Protestantism there was an objective as well as a subjective factor." So the terms "objective" and "subjective" have become domiciled in the English of New England! "As Protestantism in its origin was not an isolated event, so it drew after it political and social changes of the highest moment. Hence it presents a two-fold aspect. On the one hand, it is a transformation in the Church, in which are involved contests of theologians, modifications of creed and ritual, new systems of polity, an altered type of Christian life. On the other hand, it is a great transaction, in which sovereigns and nations bear a part; the occasion of wars and treaties; the close of an old and the introduction of a new period in the history of culture and civilization."

Next we have a brief review of the rise of the Roman hierarchy and of its history during the middle ages, all in the line of Christian history. It is the Church still, not the Synagogue of Satan, even though it is marked with error and corruption. But it is especially in presenting the causes of the Reformation that he has brought out the idea that Protestantism is the legitimate outgrowth of the better life of the Romanism of the preceding ages, directed, of course by the Holy Ghost. The development of the national languages, which followed the chaotic period of the ninth and tenth centuries, with Dante and Petrarch in Italy, Langland, Wickliffe, and Chaucer in England, and others in Germany and France, shows how the new tongues were taking the place of the Latin.

"Teutonism was holding its first initiatory struggle with Latin Christianity." The development of the science of jurisprudence raised up a class of legists who could defend the rights of the State against the encroachments of the Church. The long political struggle to become free from a hierarchy which, while calling itself spiritual, placed its heel upon the necks of kings and emperors, at length broke the spell by which the peoples of Europe seemed for a thousand years to be bound.

Coming to the inner circle of causes, we have confronting us the reaction in the sphere of the Christian religion, the theologians before the Reformation, breaking loose from the bonds of a dead scholasticism, and the uprisings among the people in various sects. The spread of mysticism, and with it humanism, together with the great revival in letters and learning, and the wonderful inventions and discoveries of the age, marked this as one of the great epochs in the history of the Church.

The writer moves here somewhat in the same spirit as Dorner in his introductory Chapter to his History of Protestant Theology, or Dr. Schaff in his Principle of Protestantism. Here is a wonderful step of progress for New England. When this theory of Church History, the theory of historical development, was given out from Mercersburg over a quarter of a century ago, it was regarded as dangerous, Romanizing. Now it has become familiar in the theological literature of this country, and quite at home even in New England.

In the latter portion of the work the author devotes a chapter of thirty-seven pages to the struggle of Protestantism in the seventeenth century, and another of some thirty pages to a sketch of the history of Protestant theology. This chapter is necessarily general and brief. It does not present the movement of theology in the deep, penetrating, and forcible way Dr. Dorner presents the subject in his work; but it shows, nevertheless, that the author grasps the underlying principle of the Protestant history down to the present time. Here is development, too. We no longer stand in the age of the Reformation. Three centuries intervene. While that epoch or age was formative for Protestant faith, and always will be

looked back to by Protestants as containing high authority in its confessions, yet these confessions are not to be set up as popes for all subsequent ages. If all history back of the Reformation could not bind the conscience or faith when the Church departed from the Holy Scriptures, neither can this Protestant tradition bind us absolutely now. All this seems strange in a New England book. German works are familiarly quoted, German words and terms introduced into the text, altogether we seem to be in a different atmosphere from what used to envelop Puritanism in New England.

And this explains to a large extent the change that is coming over the theological science of that section. Intercourse with German theology and German literature has well nigh already revolutionized the theological thinking of New England, or at any rate of its leading scholars and theologians. Some of this German influence some years ago was not of a most healthful kind. Some of our Yankee savans turned transcendentalists, and were in danger of being led captive by the rationalism of Germany. But the healthful theology of Germany as it is renovated in this century is doing a good work there.

The large, growing centres of learning in New England have done much to enlarge and liberalize thinking. Their colleges have grown into Universities. Their professors are in communion with the progress of learning in the Universities of the Old World. They have representatives from those Universities among them. Hence it is no longer the spirit of England, or Scotland that rules, but rather the more cosmopolitan spirit of the continent of Europe. And this, ultimately, will undoubtedly be the spirit that will prevail in all departments in this country—cosmopolitan, not provincial.

The prevailing element in our American nationality from the beginning has undoubtedly been the English life and spirit, but this has become so intermingled with other nationalities, that while the English language will always be the prevailing language spoken in America, its life will be moulded rather by the continent. This may easily be seen in our life generally now already. The American is not selfish, reserved, reticent, like

the Englishman. He is liberal, broad, and free, at least his aspiration and tendencies are in that direction. How could it be otherwise, if we consider the constant influence exerted among us by the various nationalities of Europe. The influences from the continent are growing stronger and stronger. The main stream is from Germany, and it has back of it the great learning and power of thought in the fatherland. We do not mean by this that Germany is about to erect itself into a controlling element in our American life, *as Germany*. That is a vain thought. German language and German peculiarities soon give way before American life. But the passing out of view of the particular European national peculiarities nevertheless leaves behind a moulding power in our national life.

What is true in general here, is especially the case in the sphere of theology. Not English, nor Scotch, nor French, but German theology, will be the main element from across the ocean, in moulding our theological science here in America. And yet it will be in no slavish way that this moulding influence will be received. Our situation and calling are peculiar. The United States, already one of the greatest powers in the world, destined it may be to become the greatest—cannot merely imitate Europe, or borrow from it, but it must reproduce the various life and spirit that reaches her from abroad.

America has already commenced a literature of her own. She has historians and poets whose claims are recognized in Europe. Perhaps least has been done in theology. This has been owing, it may be, to the intensely practical and secular spirit of the nation, developed during the times of its settling and bringing under control a new country.

The Middle States, with their smaller colleges and seminaries, have been in advance of New England in cultivating communion with German philosophy and theology. Especially is this the case in the German Churches, the Reformed and Lutheran. What is only now beginning to be taken up and used in New England, has been familiar among them for many years. But in the Middle States, in those smaller institutions, there are fewer facilities for literary work. Their libraries are small,

and their professors have scarcely any time to spare from the work of the class-room. Let the German Churches once come up to the liberality of New England, in enlarging their institutions, and they will be able to raise up a class of men who can take their place in contributing to the growing theological literature of America. Meantime we rejoice to see the progress in this direction in the larger seminaries elsewhere in the country.

Prof. Fisher's work has its defects. Some of these are incident to the plan of bringing so much within the compass of one volume, but it will on this account be welcomed by many who have not the time or taste for reading a number of volumes in order to get a correct knowledge of the general facts of the Reformation.

NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS.—As the present number of the REVIEW has been devoted mainly to articles on the Old Catholic Movement, we have been compelled to hold over several articles intended for this number of the REVIEW. They will be inserted in the July number. Thanking the contributors for their articles, we trust they will be satisfied with our explanation.